of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
SAWADA, Shigero (resumed)	29021
Direct by Mr. Cole (cont'd)	29023
(Witness excused)	29028
TANAKA, Ryukichi (recalled)	29030
Direct by Mr. Lazarus	29030
Cross by Mr. Keenan	29046
MORNING RECESS	29050
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Koenan	29050
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29051
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29056
Redirect by Mr. Lazarus	29057
Questions by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29057
(Witness excused)	29064
Spinks, Charles Nelson, Dr.	29072
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29072
NOON RECESS	29076

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

Defense' Witnesses	Page
Spinks, Charles Nelson, Dr. (cont'	1)
Cross by Brigadier Quilliam	29081
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	1e 29083
Redirect by Mr. G. Williams	29084
(Witness excused	1) 29085
Millird, Francis R.	29085
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29085
Cross by Brigadier Quilliem	29089
Redirect by Mr. G. Williams	29094
(Witness excused	29094
ISHIWATA, Sotaro (recalled)	29099
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29099
· (Witness excused	29104
MATSUKI, Tamotsu (recalled)	29105
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29105
(Witness excused	29111

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

Defense! Witnesses	Page
AFTERNOON RECESS	29111
TAKAKURA, Tadashi	29115
Direct by Nr. G. Williams	29115
(Witness excused)	29126
MURAKAMI, Kyoichi	29132
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29132
(Witness excused)	29136
OBATA, Tadayoshi	29137
Direct by Mr. G. Williams	29137

of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. Pro		For In Ident.Evidence
2566	3206	Affidavit of TANAKA, Ryukichi	29041
2584	3207	Affidavit of Dr. Che Nelson Spinks	rles 29072
2591	3208	Affidavit of Francis Millard	R. 29086
2521	3209	Affidavit of ISHIWAT Sotare	A, 29100
2526	3210	Affidavit of MATSUKI Tamotsu	, 29105
2527	3211	Affidavit of TAKAKUR Tadashi	A, 29115
	3212	Volume I of the Inte rogation of HOSHI	
606-A-1	3212-A	Excerpt therefrom	29127
2073	3213	Affidavit of MURAKAM Kyoichi	1, 29132
2592	3214	Affidavit of OBATA, Tadayoshi	29139

of

EXHIBITS

Doc. No.	Def. Pros No. No		For In Ident.Evidence
2566	3204	Affidavit of TANAKA, Ryukichi	29041
2584	3207	Affidavit of Dr. Charl Nelson Spinks	Les 29072
2591	3208	Affidavit of Francis F	29086
2521	3209	Affidavit of ISHIWATA	29100
2526	3210	Affidavit of MATSUKI, Tamotsu	29105
2527	3211	Affidavit of TAKAKURA	29115
	3212	Volume I of the Inter- rogation of HOSHING	
606-A-1	3212-A	Excerpt therefrom	29127
2073	3213	Affidavit of MURAKAMI, Kyoichi	29132
2592	3214	Affidavit of OBATA, Tadayoshi	29139

Tuesday, 23 September 1947

2

. 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 at

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not sitting from 0930 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

SHIGERO SAWADA, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission the accused SHIRATORI will be absent from the court-room for the whole of the morning session, conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: The questions I have, Mr. President, are few and constitute additional direct examination of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole, whom do you represent?

MR. COLE: General MUTO, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused MUTO is mentioned, of course? I am thinking of the order. Really you should are preceded the learned Chief of Counsel, or Mr. Sutton, was it?

MR. COLE: At the time we finished yesterday afternoon there had been no examination beyond the affidavit proper.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, then. In those circumstances you are quite right. The mistake is mine.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

8 9

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. COLE:

Q Mr. Witness, so far as you can, please give the reasons why the General Staff wanted to choose German, as mediator between Japan and Chine.

A In order to bring about peace between China and Japan, there were two methods open to us: one, to try to settle matters directly; two, to try to get a third party as mediator.

At the time military representatives of Japan and China were carrying on secret negotiations directly at Hong Kong, but these negotiations were not proceeding very successfully. Therefore it was our earnest desire to obtain the good services -- the good offices of a third party.

At the time of the ABE Cabinet a plan was drawn up whereby Japan would seek the aid -- the good offices of Great Britain. This plan was approved by the General Staff also by Imperial Headquarters. However, because of the circumstances then prevailing, this plan finally came to naught.

At the time of the YONAI Cabinet another plan was discussed whereby Japan would seek the good offices of America. This plan also finally came to nothing.

In the meantime Germany gained sweeping victories and

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24 25 the entire world situation underwent a great change.

MR. SUTTON: If it please the Tribunal, I respectfully suggest that this is quite beyond the scope of the direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That could be so.

MR. SUTTON: The witness is testifying to things as to which obviously he could not have any personal knowledge.

THE PRESIDENT: We have been allowing witnesses to testify from hearsay. Very much hearsay has been admitted on both sides; and as to the scope of the affidavit, this is further examination really, which means additional material.

There is, as I am reminded, another ground, not taken, that this refers to the general phase.

MR. COLE: If your Honor please, in the affidavit proper it was stated, without objection, that there was a strong desire to make an alliance with Germany. It is my purpose in this question to bring out that it was not an alliance so much as the help of Germany that was asked for.

THE PRESIDENT: That does not affect the accused MUTO more particularly. That also is general matter, and I am not sure that it is not repetitive. The point has been made time and again and was made

yesterday.

By a majority the question is disallowed.

BY MR. COLE (Continued):

O Mr. Witness, do you recall a visit to Japan by the Emperor of Manchukuo in the summer of 1940?

A Yes.

o If you know, at the time the YONAI Cabinet fell and immediately prior thereto where was the Emperor's visiting party?

THE PRESIDENT: How is that relevant, Mr.

Cole? We see no connection between the Emperor's

visiting party and the accused MUTO yet. There may be.

MR. COLE: I hope to show through this witness, if possible, General MUTO's absence from Tokyo and his complete disconnection with the events preceding the YONAI Cabinet's fall.

THE PRESIDENT: You want to prove an alibi, as it is called. Proceed to question on that basis.

Q Will the witness answer, please?

A According to my recollection the Emperor of Manchukuo arrived in Tokyo around the end of June and stayed there until the beginning of July and then for some time thereafter visited various parts of Japan.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: The Emperor of Manchukuo reached Japan, reached Tokyo, either around the end of June or the beginning of July, and then, after staying there for some time, toured various parts of Japan.

Q Can you state whether the Emperor and his party were in Japan at the time the YONAI Cabinet fell? I should say, rather, in Tokyo.

A It was in the beginning of July that I returned to Tokyo from China. At that time the Emperor had already left Tokyo and therefore he was not in Tokyo at the time the YONAI Cabinet fell.

Q Do you know whether General MUTO was a

8

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

member of the Emperor's party? A I do not know whether he accompanied him on that occasion. However, it is but natural that important officials from the War Ministry should accompany the Emperor on such a visit. Q At the time you talked with Lieutenant General ANAMI, shortly prior to General HATA's resignation, did you talk to any other officials in the War Ministry about it? A I talked only with Vice-Minister of War ANAMI on this problem, and talked with no one else about it. Q And can you fix more exactly the date on which you handed the letter to General HATA? A I do not remember the date exactly. Q Do you know the exact date when War Minister HATA hended in his resignation? A I believe it was either the 16th or 17th of July that General HATA handed in his resignation. However, I am really not sure on this point. MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, the

prosecution does not desire to cross-examine this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual terms.

1

20

22

24

7 8

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution respectfully requests permission of the Court for the recall of Admiral YONAI for the purpose of putting to him a very few questions for reasons that I will state very briefly, if permitted.

THE PRESIDENT: The English version of his affidavit was referred to the Language Section for revision. Perhaps we should hear the result in the meantime, before we hear you, Mr. Chief of Counsel. The amendments, if any, of the translation may necessitate the recall of the witness, although, as he does not speak English, that is not likely.

MR. KEENAN: In the event that he is not so required, with great respect the prosecution represents earnestly to the Court that the questions will be very brief, the reason for their being put quite apparent, and they will have a material effect upon the issues of this trial.

THE PRESIDENT: If some new material has come to light, something that was not available to the prosecution before, there can be no question.

Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, I did not wish to interrupt the Chief Prosecutor, Mr. Joseph Keenan,

wanted the witness SAWADA to step down only temporarily. We think we will have a certificate with reference to the letter from the First Demobilization Bureau, and may recall him to the stand later this afternoon, sir. If we return him, sir, it will only be to allow the prosecution to cross-examine, if the letter should be accepted after our certificate is introduced. We do not want any more questions.

I Is acceptation in it true and designer

The next witness will be TANAKA, Ryukichi.

b

RYUKICHI TANAKA, recalled as a wit-1 ness on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese 3 interpreters as follows: 5 MR. LAZARUS: May the witness be shown document 2206? 6 (Whereupon, a document was handed . 8 to the witness.) 9 THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oath, Witness. 10 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. LAZARUS: 13 Is that your affidavit, General TANAKA? 14 Yes. then As made to the anti-15 Is everything in it true and correct? 16 They are true and correct. 17 MR. LAZARUS: I now offer in evidence de-18 fense document 2206. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel. 20 21 22 23 organ to contains the common natural and of Santata

24

G 1 2 e 3 h 4 e 5 g 6 & 7 a 8 r t 9 o n 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to the following parts of this first affidavit of General TANAKA, defense document 2206:

In the first paragraph, the second sentence, on the ground that the above sentence states merely conclusions and inferences of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The second sentence reads,
"I am one of his friends who knows him best."

MR. KEENAN: I beg the Court's pardon: the third sentence. Objection is made to the whole of the second paragraph on the ground that there is available more substantial evidence, and this is the type of hearsay that should be disregarded.

Objection is made to the entire paragraph starting on the last part of the first page and ending with the words "outlying post."

Objection is made to the first paragraph on page 2 on the ground that it contains multiple conclusions of the witness and does not constitute statement of fact; and the second paragraph on page 2 for the same reason as stated above.

The third paragraph on the second page because it contains unwarranted assumptions of matters not in evidence;

The fourth paragraph on page 2 on the ground

23 24

3

5

6

8

10

11

13

15 16

17

18

19

21

23

22

24

it contains assumptions and conclusions of this witness and a statement of fact that must have been
without his personal knowledge as appears by the
matters therein concerned;

The last sentence of the fifth paragraph on page 2;

The prosecution moves to strike out the last sentence of the paragraph on page 3 which began on page 2.

The prosecution moves to strike the entire last paragraph of this affidavit. It has to do with the experience of General HATA when a young officer studying in Germany which, it is respectfully submitted, is far beyond the confines of this trial.

For the reasons stated, Mr. President, the prosecution asks that the entire affidavit at this time be rejected with instructions to recast it and draft it to make a fair proportion germane and pertinent to some of the issues of this cause.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President and your Honors, before I take up, point by point, the objections of the Chief Prosecutor, Mr. Keenan, I would like to give this background to the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Deal with each point.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11-

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LAZARUS: General TANAKA says that, at the time that he relates these matters, he was a member of the War Ministry. Therefore, the general observation that some of these matters may have been beyond his personal knowledge holds no water.

With reference to the second paragraph, that it contains hearsay matter, Mr. President, just a few minutes ago you, yourself, stated that much hearsay has been taken in on both sides. For an entire month this witness has introduced evidence on behalf of the prosecution in substantially the same manner, giving the exact type of information that he is giving here, sir. In that second paragraph, if the Tribunal will please follow me, I have circled the second sentence beginning, "The question of" down to the words, "General Staff" -- that middle sentence.

THE PRESIDENT: You cannot prove the contents of a letter by hearsay.

MR. LAZARUS: That's correct, Mr. President. That is why I say I have circled that to be omitted the middle part of that paragraph. The remainder of the paragraph contains no reference to the letter, Mr. President, and cortains statements that were made directly to the witness, which are not hearsay.

In reference to the last paragraph on the

3 .

first page, there is no reason assigned. He simply stated that it ought to be stricken. Allegations have been made in the Indictment and at other times during the trial that all these accused, including General HATA, are conspirators and aggressors, Mr. President. This is evidence, if the Tribunal please, which definitely contradicts any tendency towards a conspiracy and, certainly, against aggression against the United States and Great Britain.

The second full paragraph on the second page, beginning "Although HATA was" down to "the Emperor TAISHO," I agree, refers to the letter and should be stricken in conformity with your decision yesterday.

With reference to the next paragraph, "With reference to General HATA's belief," etc., Mr. Chief Prosecutor has stated that there is no material of that type in evidence. Only this morning the SAWADA affidavit contained the exact same facts, Mr. President, and this is confirmation from another source that General HATA did reduce the troops in China from 900,000 to 600,000.

Mr. Keenan wishes me to state that he announced to me yesterday that he would make these objections, which is perfectly correct; and I also

3

1

5

6

8

20

10

11

13

15

14

16

19 20

18

22

23

21

24

wish to add that for a full week there has been quite a bit of cooperation on both sides in making agreements as to what should or should not be stricken, but there were more objections than we had agreed to, Mr. Keenan.

The next to the last paragraph on page 2, beginning with "In 1940," is stated by Mr. Chief Prosecutor to be without the knowledge of the witness. It is very definitely within the knowledge of the witness, Mr. President, because he states that he was a member of the War Ministry during this period.

On page 3, the last sentence of that first paragraph, "However, not long after" --

THE PRESIDENT: Doesn't Mr. Keenan object to the part beginning "If General HATA had remained in office"?

MR. LAZARUF: This witness had been the one who had been carrying on the negotiations. He would certainly be competent to say whether or not, in his opinion, Mr. President, had General HATA stayed in office, the treaty would have been successfully concluded. At any rate, sir, the last sentence should stay.

In the last paragraph we give to this Tribunal the background of what caused General HATA to carry

on throughout his life an antipathy towards any alliance with the Germans. The matter is not improper, sir. If the Tribunal will remember, our friends in the Russian prosecution went back to 1904, and the President stated at that time, when we objected, "It may be used to show a course of action or a trend in action," and this is the same here, sir, I very respectfully submit. At all events, if the Tribunal please, in the middle of the paragraph, beginning "In 1941, when he was Commander in Chief of the Japanese forces," certainly that is evidence, what he did in 1941.

DIRECT

THE PRESIDENT: The Russians weren't allowed to go back to 1904 to prove the type of education that any individual got or what that individual's tendency was. That is the sort of thing we are examining now.

MR. IAZARUS: Well, then, Mr. President, beginning with the words "In 1941, when he was Commander in Chief," this answers the very question that the President of the Tribunal and one of his colleagues asked yesterday of the witness, OIKAWA. This is direct evidence, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: I must remind you that a Judge may ask a question which could not be answered

on throughout his life an antipathy towards any alliance with the Germans. The matter is not improper,
sir. If the Tribunal will remember, our friends in
the Russian prosecution went back to 1904, and the
President stated at that time, when we objected,
"It may be used to show a course of action or a trend
in action," and this is the same here, sir, I very
respectfully submit. At all events, if the Tribunal
please, in the middle of the paragraph, beginning
"In 1941, when he was Commander in Chief of the
Japanese forces," certainly that is evidence, what
he did in 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: The Russians weren't allowed to go back to 1904 to prove the type of education that any individual got or what that individual's tendency was. That is the sort of thing we are examining now.

MR. LAZARUS: Well, then, Mr. President, beginning with the words "In 1941, when he was Commander in Chief," this answers the very question that the President of the Tribunal and one of his colleagues asked yesterday of the witness, OIKAWA. This is direct evidence, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: I must remind you that a Judge may ask a question which could not be answered

in any examination in chief. A Judge can ask any question that a cross-examiner may ask. You can elicit in cross-examination matters which could not be included in examination in chief.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, I offer no objection to any questions asked by the Tribunal. On the contrary, I am trying to be helpful to the Tribunal and point out that, when it was wondered whether this witness went to anyone else's office, here is the answer that, indeed, the witness did go. I agree that the first part could be stricken; but, certainly, the part starting "In 1941" showing that HATA, in order to avoid war, sent his personal emissary to Tokyo to ask them to avoid it is good evidence, sir, and this witness has direct knowledge of that fact.

THE PRESIDENT: A majority of the Tribunal sustained so many of the objections that the document will be emasculated if it is left in its present condition. Therefore, we suggest to you strongly to withdraw it and put in only the matters which we hold are admissible. We shall indicate those.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: We suggest the witness be stood down until we meet and indicate just the parts

which should be omitted.

MR. LAZARUS: He has another affidavit, Mr. President. We can proceed with the next one.

to the witness.)

BY 'R. LAZARUS (Continued):

. Q Is that your affidavit?

Yes, it is. that General With sould not

MR. LAZARUS: I offer in evidence 2566.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to only the last two paragraphs of this second affidavit on the ground that both contain, in substance, in their practical entirety testimony that could not be within the personal knowledge of this witness but constitute mere conclusions and, in one instance, comes dangerously close to, if not actually, forswearing the issue.

MR. LAZARUS: These are not conclusions on the part of the witness, Mr. President. I again remind the Tribunal that this witness was a member of the War Ministry at the time these events took place and does have knowledge. For over a month this witness testified in the same vein for the

2

1

1

5

.

7

8

9

10

. .

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

1 prosecution. Now he has information of value to 2 one of the accused and the prosecution sees fit to 3 object. THE PRESIDENT: We will discuss the prosecu-5 tion's objections on their merits. We will not dis-6 cuss the prosecution's motives. MR. LAZARUF: In the first of the two para-8 graphs objected to he states, in the middle, that the 9 General Staff feared that General HATA would not 10 carry out the instructions. That is definite evi-11 dence that General HATA was not in favor of trying 12 these people by military law. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Was TANAKA on the General 14 Staff at that time? 15 . LAZARUF: No. Mr. President. He was 16 Chief of a certain bureau in the War Ministry, and 17 the Kempeitai who examined these flyers were under his control. He knows all about it, and, in fact, he states he spoke personally about the case and interceded on behalf of the flyers with the Vice-Chief of the General Staff. Therefore he has persound knowledge, Mr. President. 23 THE PREFIDENT: He does not give what conver-24 sations he had or with whom or when.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, that could be

very well brought out on cross-examination. I have kept the affidavits, if you notice, down to a bare minimum. We could have gone on for page after page that way.

He states, in the third paragraph on the first page, if the Tribunal will look, "... I protested the decision to General TANABE, Vice-Chief of the General Staff, and stated to him that in my opinion the flyers should be treated as prisoners of war." That gives him direct knowledge, Mr. President. He does state that he did speak with them, and that's where this information comes from. If it doesn't, it could very well be ascertained on cross-examination. That's what cross-examination is for.

7

8

9

10

12

13

23

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 256 will receive exhibit No. 3206.

> (Whereupon, the document above ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3206 and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading)

"At the time of the raid on Tokyo by the American fliers in April of 1942 I was Chief of the Military Service Section of the War Ministry. Because during the raid school children had been shot 14 and non-military areas had been bombed there were dif-15 ferent opinions as to the treatment to be given fliers who became prisoners. The General Staff in Tokyo decided that all decisions as to the trial and treatment of the captured fliers should be exclusively within the province of the General Staff itself. Hence, as soon as the fliers were captured in China the General 21 Staff ordered their immediate delivery to Tokyo. All 22 relative investigations were made in Tokyo and preparations were made to hold the trial of the fliers in Tokyo. However, as to the treatment to be given the fliers there developed two different opinions. One opinion was sup-

ported by the Gameral Staff and the other by the War

Ministry. Because of these conflicting opinions the

General Staff suddenly gave up its intention to hold

the trial in Tokyo and ordered that the trial be held

in China and an order to that effect was forwarded to

the China Expeditionary Army Headquarters and the

fliers themselves were sent to Shanghai.

"In those days there wasn't any regulations that fliers could be tried by a military court and so in Tokyo a new military law as to the treatment of fliers who raided the Japanese homeland and the area under its control was promulgated and a copy of the new order was forwarded to the China Expeditionary Force with or rs that the same law would be in effect in the areas controlled by the Japanese armies in China also. In the same order containing the information about the new military law just promulgated, was contained an order to Headquarters of the Japanese Expeditionary Army in China that the fliers would be tried under this law in China. Because there was no military court set up in the Headquarters of the China Expeditionary Forces at Nanking, the trial was to be held by the 13th Army at its headquarters in Shanghai.

23 24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Reichers & Yelden

. 3

. 17

"When the decision was announced that the fliers would be tried by the newly promulgated military law, I protested the decision to General TANABE, Vice-Chief of the General Staff, and stated to him that in my opinion the fliers should be treated as prisoners of war. General TANABE stated that he agreed with me and not only was that so, but that he had just received a letter from General USHIROGU, General HATA's Chief of Staff, stating that General HATA was of that opinion himself, that he, HATA, desired to treat the fliers as prisoners of war. General TANABE then stated that nothing could be done about the matter because the General Staff had already made the decision that the fliers must be tried by military law.

"According to the practice of the Japanese army, the sort of letter that USHIROGU wrote to TANABE was never written by the Commander himself but it was always written by the Chief of Staff and when the Chief of Staff expresses anything in the official letter, that is the expression of the intentions of the Commander in Chief himself, not the opinion of the Chief of Staff. That was the practice in the Japanese army and such a letter is never addressed to the Chief of the General Staff, always to the Vice-Chief of the General Staff. That, too, was the practice of the

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

Japanese army. Therefore, when I learned that USHIROGU had written a letter containing the views of HATA and the letter was addressed to the Vice-Chief of the General Staff, I knew that it was an official letter in the usual practice of the Japanese army informing the General Staff of the position and the opinion of the Commander in Chief of the Japanese Armies in China, General HATA.

"As a result of the receipt of this letter from General USHIROGU stating the position of General HATA with reference to the fliers, Colonel ARISUE was dispatched from Tokyo by the General Staff to HATA to give HATA the orders and the desires of the General Staff. The General Staff in Tokyo was afraid that HATA would not carry out the instructions of putting the fliers to trial and Colonel ARISUE was sent to HATA to notify HATA that he was to do as he was ordered and that no theory or logic on his part with reference to this case would be accepted by Tokyo. Moreover, there was another apprehension among the members of the General Staff, that even if the China Expediti mary Force tried these fliers, they might have found a decision of not guilty and that HATA would then have released them after trial and this the General Staff feared.

"Thus, as the matter stood, all orders and directives with reference to the trial were issued by the General Staff in Tokyo and the trial was held by the 13th Army in China. Hence, in this trial, General Headquarters of the China Expeditionary Army merely acted as a channel through which were transmitted the orders of the General Staff in Tokyo to the 13th Army where the triel was being held. There was absolutely no room left whatsoever for the use of any discretion or judgment on the part of the members of the Headquarters of the China Expeditionary Force with reference to this trial." THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

G - In about, one endutorism what they doubt

be executed, the file of the was that they should

The Arm your marked the educate apparent, the

C And If I stadeworms your affileast on your

atabayont ascartably, that man the view held by Aba

"or Ministry, to bold these per as priceduce and most

be become a destant on columns of war, in that

The are sent one

A I as weeted the mile opinion.

at the may be at 12 sarter

14

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEENAN: She Cuneral Steel was some.

Q Have you any personal knowledge, General
TANAKA, with reference to the shooting of any
school children by the fliers?

betwa . I do. . . Shiptow set fin General State . At

Q Did you see any of them shot down?

. A I did not see them actually being shot. I merely received reports.

Q There were, as I understand, two views or two different opinions as to the treatment to be given the fliers who had become prisoners as a result of the raid, is that right?

A Yes. Haltery tarrilla burant was aparmy a tiris

Q In short, one opinion was that they should be executed, the other opinion was that they should be humanely treated as prisoners of war, is that right?

A Yes, as you say.

Q And you shared the second opinion, the milder one, we will say?

A I advocated the mild opinion.

Q And, if I understand your affidavit or your statement accurately, that was the view held by the War Ministry, to hold these men as prisoners and not

2

1

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

16

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

to execute them?

veyed to the War Ministry in a conference of Bureau chiefs of the War Ministry by Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau SATO, who was then acting as liaison between the War Ministry and the General Staff. At this conference War Minister TOJO definitely opposed this view saying that that was wrong. It is true that some of the junior officers were rather extreme in their views; however, since the War Minister himself said that the extreme view was wrong, I believe it is right to say that the view of the War Ministry was as you said.

The Military Service Bureau was against this execution right up to the end. The Military Service Bureau did not set its seal on this procedure until after the General Staff had already obtained the Imperial sanction. The reason why the Military Service Bureau had to put its seal on this document ordering this procedure was that, as the agency controlling the Kempeitai, it had some responsibility in the case since the report of the Tokyo Kempeitai head-quarters which investigated these fliers was channeled through the Military Service Bureau -- correction: since the Military Service Bureau was controlling the

Kempeitai as far as ordinary business routine went. 1 General, I will try to keep my questions 2 3 as concise as possible and will you cooperate to 4 keep your answers likewise concise? 5 Thank you. 6 You used the term, "extreme view"; was that 7 a polite expression for execution or death penalty? 8 Yes, as you say. 9 Now, you have been good enough to tell us all those who were in favor of the milder view; will 10 11 you now tell us who were responsible personally -- the 12 men -- for overruling the views of so important a 13 figure as TOJO -- General TOJO or Minister TOJO? 14 Who were the men who wanted to execute these fliers 15 in Tokyc? 16 The Chief of the General Staff, the Vice-17 Chief of the General Staff --18 Will you give their names? General SUGIYAMA, Gen, Chief of the General Staff.

Q He has passed away, I understand?

Yes.

Who else?

The Vice-Chief of the General Staff is also responsible since, although at first he opposed the

19

20

22

23

21

24

step, later he agreed to it.

Who was he?

Lieutenant General TANABE, Moritake.

Anyone else?

All the members of the First Department of the General Staff.

Can you give us the names of some of the more prominent men, briefly?

Chief of the First Department, then Major General, later Lieutenant General TANAKA, Shinichi. I have lorgotten the names of the section chiefs in that department.

As I understand, the fliers were captured in China the day after the raid in Tokyo and a few days afterwards were returned to Tokyo from China, is that correct?

Yes.

Would it not have been in accordance with ordinary procedure here in Japan to have the trials take place at the situs or location where the alleged offenses were committed?

Yes, as you say.

And on this very important occasion that procedure was departed from, was it not?

Yes, as you say.

19

20 21

22

23 24

If they had been tried in Tokyo, would you have had to do with the procedure?

I would have had nothing to do with the actual trial. I would be connected, however, with the investigation that would lead up to the trial.

That might have a great deal to do with what occurred at the trial?

Yes.

So that --

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

> (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel. BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

You have told us the names of some of the members of the General Staff who favored the execution of the fliers. You have told us that the Prime Minister, who was also, I believe, the War Minister, and perhaps other ministers at the time. TOJO, the accused, opposed the execution; that some subordinates in the War Ministry favored execution. Who were they?

u & S

D

pratt

21

22

23

24

3

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

A I have no exact recollection of names at the present moment. However, there were some among the junior officers who held very extreme opinions. I remerber that members of the Military Administration Section of the Military Affairs Bureau held quite extreme views, but I have forgotten their names.

Q Has it become a habit or was it a habit in Japan at that time and some years previous that when extreme views about executing and murdering people were held they were declared to be held only by junior officers?

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: On behalf of a Member of the Tribunal, I desire the witness to state whether there was any section in the General Staff or elsewhere that favored a trial of the fliers.

THE WITNESS: The Defense Headquarters held a very strong opinion in this matter.

- Q Who was the head of the Defense Headquarters?
- A At the time it was Prince HIGASHIKUNI.
- Q Was that view held by him?

A Since I heard this strong opinion from General KOBAYASHI, who was Chief of Staff of Defense Head-quarters, I do not know what Prince HIGASHIKUNI's

2

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

23

25

opinions were personally.

Q Do you know whether Prince HIGASHIKUNI had anything to do with the promulgation of any law or any regulation having to do with the execution of fliers who were captured?

A It was the duty of the General Defense Headquarters to issue laws in so far as they concerned the Japanese homeland.

Q Is this one of these laws you referred to protecting the homeland?

A What I meant to say was that just as the Commander of the Expeditionary Forces in China received a certain standard from the central authorities and promulgated a law relative to the trial of these fliers in China based on that standard, so in the Japanese homeland it was the duty of General Defense Headquarters to promulgate laws in so far as they concerned Japan.

THE INTERPRETER: The word "duty" should be stricken.

THE MONITOR: It was Defense Headquarters which in the Japanese homeland issued such orders, or issued such laws.

Q You have mentioned the name of the Chief of the Branch, but you haven't answered, I think, the

question I asked about the subordinates in the War Ministry who favored the execution of the Doolittle fliers?

A As I recall now, it was a certain Lieutenant Colonel OTSUKI, who was serving in the Military Administration Section of the Military Affairs Bureau, who came to me several times in order to most strongly urge upon me his opinion that the fliers should be severely punished. I have forgotten his first name.

Q Who was the head of the Military Affairs
Bureau Section at that time?

A It was Colonel NISHIURA.

Q when did this sharp difference of opinion as to the treatment of the fliers occur with relation to the Doolittle raid itself?

A This violent opposition arose immediately upon receipt of word from China that the fliers who had bombed Tokyo had been caught there.

Q That was the next day after the raid?

A Yes.

Q What were the reasons ascribed by those who wanted these fliers executed -- captured fliers?

A The reason they ascribed was that since at the time we were very afraid of the possibility of bombing raids by American planes on Japan if the

10

9

1

2

3

4

11

13

14

16 17

18

20 21

22

23

fliers were executed it would cause the American 1 air force to fear -- the members of the American air force to fear their possible fate and thus to 3 desist from bombing Japan. 4 A campaign of terrorism? 5 Yes. " views everyeled, and apparently the 6 battered Other was to lave its way to execute these wen. 7 The goods dead not make been done by proceedings to 8 Trivol Non was it serversary to spain send them ell 9 Lant Mark South Mar Charges of 10 1 4 of course, I 46 mot make the wrest reasons. 11 hat in growled, stone some in the business it was also 12 gather brong that a new willtamy has be becoming that 13 Agtor too had but one brok and the filling be being he 14 Fig lasts of fast now law, the captral authorities that 15 16 test to would not be anopol to both the tries in Telephone 17 In a word, I to be you can may than it was the dealth 18 of the central military sutherstand to avoid their chief 19 rouger administry. 20 Q . They falt every wally, shows that they could 21 get their desires of the execution of these filers 22 rentied out better by sending them to the Chick wrents 28 24 Ware they sunt beek to China before the last 25

was prominated or afterwards?

Q Now, will you tell us, General, why these fliers could not be tried in Tokyo since they were brought back specifically for the purpose of Tokyo jurisdiction? To complete the question: The Prime Minister's, War Minister's views had been overruled, the War Ministry views overruled, and apparently the General Staff was to have its way to execute these men. Why could that not have been done by proceedings in Tokyo? Why was it necessary to again send them all the way back to Shanghai?

A Of course, I do not know the exact reasons, but in general, since even in my opinion it was altogether wrong that a new military law be promulgated after the act had occurred and the fliers be tried on the basis of that new law, the central authorities felt that it would not be proper to hold the trial in Tokyo. In a word, I think you can say that it was the desire of the central military authorities to evade their own responsibility.

Q They felt, apparently, secure that they could get their desires of the execution of these fliers carried out better by sending them to the China area?

A I suppose they did.

Q Were they sent back to China before the law was promulgated, or afterwards?

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

18

17

19 20

21 22

Gere!

23 24

25

If my recollection serves me right, the law was promulgated toward the end of July, whereas the fliers were sent to China on the 18th of June. The draft plan of this military law, of course, had been drawn up long before, but because of violent opposition the promulgation, the actual promulgation, of the law had been delayed.

What would have happened to the accused HATA had he refused to carry out the law? Would the execution have taken place in his district nevertheless?

If he had refused probably General HATA would have been relieved of his post as commander and a new commander sent out, and I believe the new commander would have carried out the execution.

Q But the worst that would have happened to. General HATA, had he refused to carry out the command, would have been that he would have been relieved of his command; that is, even assuming that the instructions he received were tantamount to a command?

Yes. AZARTU - Turther same tites.

THE PRESIDENT: Was the command to execute? THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE RESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

bed are the brist, was more funedly

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LLAZARUS:	to: This order	in the s	e construction	
------------------	----------------	----------	----------------	--

Q General TANAKA, the orders to General HATA, were they to hold the trial?

The first order that went to General HATA was for the trial of these fliers. A later order ordered that they be severely punished.

Q Where did the order come from commuting the death sentence of five of the fliers to life imprisonment?

A I think it came direct from the Emperor.

Q And the order saving the lives of five of the fliers went straight to General HATA?

A Through the General Staff. I think it was routed through the General Staff.

Q And that order contained that the sentence will be carried out against the other three whose sentence was not commuted?

A Yes, as you say. The state of the state of

MR. LAZARUS: No further questions, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague desires further particulars about those two orders to hold a trial and to punish severely. Did the second order come before the trial was concluded?

8

6

7

1

2

3

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

3

6

7

9

11

12

14

16

19

20

18

21

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: The order came before the trial was even started. This order was communicated verbally through Colonel ARISUYE.

THE PRESIDENT: To whom was the order directed?

THE WITNESS: The Chief of the General Staff

personally sent Colonel ARISUYE as his emissary to

General HATA, commander of the forces in China, and

communicated this order.

THE PRESIDENT: The order was an oral order; it was not in writing, is that so?

THE WITNESS: I was not, of course, on the spot, but I heard from Major General MIYANO that the order was oral.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Kr. President, with reference to General TANAKA's other affidavit, will we meet later, is that correct, sir, and the Court point out which part should be kept out?

THE PRESIDENT: The position is that a majority of the Tribunal uphold all the objections. But instead of admitting the document with the balance, we ask you to rewrite it and have it sworn.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, sir. Then, with the exception of the remaining affidavit of General TANAKA and the revised affidavit of the witness, NODA, who

YONAI?

1 2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

23

25

stepped down yesterday because his affidavit was not in order, this concludes the case of the accused HATA. On advice of counsel, he will not take the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you recalling Admiral.

MR. LAZARUS: No, Mr. President, we do not think he should be recalled. I understand, though, that this morning Mr. Chief Prosecutor thought that he would like to request the Tribunal to recall him for him.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand no change has been made by the Language Section in the original. Of course, there could not be. It is only in the franslation, and as it is in English, there may be no ground for recalling YONAI.

sight sen the exercised conv as it will be approved a

please, they are both rough, but we have not the soples

to be their touced or than ore friends out follow as

THE PERSONNEL TEACH YOU, BUILTY

reflered. Mave you that ready yet, Majora

tilly are being road, sir.

THE PERSONNEL PART OF MORROW BELLEVILLE WES

DANGER OF ANY INCH THE THE JOS MOUNTS IN THE TO MAKE THE

ing latters with exterence to the without

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Major Moore.

ANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, the corrections to the two affidavits are ready. The copies to be distributed to the Tribunal are in preparation at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: I think my Colleagues would like to know now what alterations in the English trans-lation you suggest, Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): I will be ready to report after the noon recess, if the Tribunal please.

THE PRESIDENT: Are they so extensive that you need more time?

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): They are so extensive, if the Tribunal please, that we felt that they should be prepared in order that the Tribunal might see the corrected copy as it will be approved.

THE PRESIDENT: Part of another affidavit was referred. Have you that ready yet, Major?

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, they are both ready, but we have not the copies to be distributed so that the Tribunal can follow as they are being read, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Major.

MR. LAZARUS: With reference to the witness

. 21

22

29,061

TANAKA, R.

SAWADA, t' certificate of which I spoke about earlier this morning; Mr. President, with reference to that letter, it will be ready some time this afternoon, and, at the convenience of the Tribunal, we will introduce it.

Perhaps the Tribunal would prefer that it be introduced at the same time that the revised affidavit of General TANAKA is introduced, plus the corrected one of General NODA. To save time we will do that.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel, are you still pressing for the recall of YONAI, assuming that it will not be necessary to recall him when we get the redraft or the amended translation?

MR. KEENAN: Yes, Mr. President. It has to do with the misapprehension of counsel as to one answer of YONAI's, as to whether or not he made certain answers in an interrogation, which co-counsel at the table understood him to deny he even had the interview. It is a rather important statement. They would be a categorical questions, to admit or deny them, and we want to lay the foundation for their introduction, and we believe they are highly important and may even be highly determinative of issues at the time of the verdict.

I will state to the President of the Tribunal that this request did not come, was not made, I remind

2

.

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

23

1 2 3

4 5

the Court, after we had been informed that the accused would not take the stand and I might state to the Court we have been informed definitely by learned counsel for the occused that he would take the stand, but it had nothing to do with our position in making this request.

MR. LAZARUS: I am afraid I must challenge that last remark. The statement had been made in several conferences that if the accused takes the stand he will take it without an affidavit. That had been clearly understood. Although a document number had been prepared, the affidavit was never translated and it was never intended to use it.

Now, as to the other part, the recalling of YONAI. As the President stated earlier this morning, if it had been something that had been discovered recently since the witness had left the stand, then very probably the Tribunal could recall the witness for further cross-examination. However, by the Chief Prosecutor's very word a moment ago, sir, it is only a misapprehension on the part of one counsel at the table as to whether or not the question was answered. There not being anything new, Mrr. President, I suggest there is no need to recall the witness and prolong this part of the trial.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, for the time being, I don't quite understand why the misapprehension of counsel should be a justification for recalling YONAI. If there is something obscure in the transcript, that might be.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution desires to be entirely candid with the Tribunal. I think that the transcript will not show an ambiguity, but there was difficulty at the time with the transmission system, difficulty of hearing the witness and of the transmission over the earphones, so that a question asked him was misunderstood by myself.

But, however, I appeal to the discretion of the Court and say this: It has to do simply with a sworn interrogation that we had in the record and perhaps he would not have to be recalled. Indeed, the Court discouraged further cross-examination at a certain period because of the denial of the witness of statements made.

We intend, Mr. President, in rebuttal to offer statements made by YONAI germane to the issue and highly important, and will consider it proper rebuttal, but we may be met with the objection that he hasn't been tendered the precise questions. We are attempting to clear that up only by recalling him.

-

3

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: You merely want to be fair to YONAI. You offer to be fair to him. His counsel objects and that is all you need do, Mr. Chief of Counsel. That is your argument as we understand it.

In those circumstances, there is no need to recall YONAI. You may tender that evidence in rebuttal.

What is the next individual case? Perhaps you can get through the opening.

MR. LAZARUS: May the witness be dismissed, Mr. President, on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: May it please the Tribunal, with the permission of the Tribunal and pursuant to agreement with the other accused, the individual case for the accused HOSHINO is being presented ahead of the regular order, because of the necessity for the absence of one of the counsel in the case. If that is agreeable, I shall proceed with the opening statement.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand there is no objection on the part of the Tribunal.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir.

Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal:

he evidence to be offered on behalf of the accused HUSHINO will be divided for the sake of clarity into three parts: the Manchurian period from 1932 to 1940; the Planning Board period from 1940 until April 1941; and the period after October 18, 1941 when he was Chief Secretary of the TOJO Cabinet. The career of the accused will be treated briefly, beginning with the time when, while still a minor official in the Finance Ministry, he was asked to go to assist with his experience the Finance Ministry of Manchukuo. He accepted and, through his ability and his sincere interest in the country, eventually became Chief of the General Affairs Board of the Manchukuo Government. for HOSHINO's appointment as Chief of the General Affairs Bureau in 1936, his relations with the Premier, the limitations on his authority as well as the fact that the Iureau was not dictated to by the Kwantung Army will be explained by the witness MATSUKI.

Refutation of the prosecutions's charge against HOSHINO of exploitation in Manchuria will be provided by evidence showing:

1. HOSHINO's sincere and unremitting efforts toward instituting many of the general improvements in Manchukuo outlined briefly in the general Manchurian Phase, such as reformation of the financial system (concerning which the Lytton Report expressed doubt as

3

1

2

7

6

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

to the possibility of accomplishment), reduction of taxes on the people and establishment of a fair tax system, agricultural and other general economic 3 development of the country; 2. His removal of salary discriminations between Japanese and native Manchurians and his replacement of Japanese officials with Manchurians in important posts, so much so that he was criticized as being too pro-Manchurian rather than pro-Japanese; her species rights out interpolate in Homesteria by extragalation too percepture terral and other action 11 12 13 this efforts towards endication of out to 14 15 addiction to as short a time as possible through the 16 Tor-West linn, and his populating to the Use of 17 and configuration furnity for grane por case rather than 18 test the ration of the tetan notion. 19 say of the operation of the action of the 20 21 22 23

tel in foreign control for outleins or toucherstor

Jameter Copital, the pair James as or attorities.

25

3. His attempts to sell Manchurian products to Japan at as high a price as possible and to buy Japanese products for Manchukuo as cheaply as possible, as well as his efforts against manipulation of tariffs in favor of Japan.

- 4. His attempts to prevent any Japanese policy he considered adverse to the interests of the people of Manchukuo from being carried out; for instance, his constant efforts to have Japan give up her special rights and interests in Manchuria by relinquishing her extraterritorial and other rights, one of the effects of which was to greatly increase the taxes imposed on Japanese residents;
- 5. His efforts towards eradication of opium addiction in as short a time as possible through the Ten-Year Plan, and his opposition to the use of mor poly revenue funds for general use rather than for the opium prohibition policy.

Refutation of the charge of economic exclusion and discrimination in favor of Japanese will be shown by:

- 1. HOSHINO's interest and support of bringing in foreign capital for building up Manchuria;
- 2. His attitude of equal treatment for all foreign capital, whether Japanese or otherwise.

In July of 1940, while still in Manchuria where he had labored for eight years improving that country, Mr. HOSHINO was asked to join the Second KONOYE Cabinet as President of the Planning Board and Minister Without Portfolio. He accepted this promotion and came to Japan. The evidence of the prosecution, as well as other evidence, has already shown that at the time HOSHINO joined the KONOYE Cabinet the basic Cabinet policy had already been set by the Four Minister Conference. The difficulties faced by the Planning Board in attempting to meet the demands for allocations of the Army, Navy and the civilian economy bans of foreign countries, and the lack of planning for any future war, will be shown by the witness OBATA.

motion for dismissal, alleged that the Planning Board planned for government control of industry in Japan. The witness OBATA will explain, however, how HOSHINO and others of the Cabinet changed the plan for governmental control of industry, the original "new economic structure," in favor of more control by the businessmen and less by the Government.

The duties and position of an "explainer" or "exponent" at the Privy Council, in which capacity HOSHINO attended the Privy Council meeting on the Tripartite Pact, will be briefly explained. Concerning HOSHINO's relations with the Total War Research Institute, it will be explained how, although HOSHINO was appointed nominally as acting director of that Institute at the time it was set up because of his position on the Planning Board, he showed no interest in the Institute and until the time of his relief from the post did nothing to get the Institute started.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the issue of conspiracy it should be noted that the prosecution attempted to establish its conspiracy charges against HOSHINO primarily by virtue of his relations with the accused General TOJO. The not s of Prince KONOYE concerning the Cabinet changes in economic ministers will show that it was none other than TOJO who informed HOSHINO that he must resign from the Cabinet. The evidence will show that from the time of his resignation of 4 April 1941 until the following October, HOSHINO spent a great deal of his time travelling around Japan. His contact with TOJO was limited to one courtesy call and he had no contact with "professional politicians." He had already bought a ticket in anticipation of going to Korea when he was unexpectedly asked to become Chief Cabinet Secretary. It will be shown that one of his future subordinates,

INANA, who had been in the Cabinet Secretariat since 1937, was asked by TOJO for his opinion on the type of person best suited for the post of Chief Cabinet Secretary and that, after giving his opinion, INADA approved of HOSHINO from among several named by TOJO. Regarding the war policy TOJO never asked HOSHINO's opinion nor did HOSHINO give him any but merely carried out his instructions as a secretary.

The position of the Chief Cabinet Secretary will be explained by Cabinet regulations, a witness who formerly held that office, and the interrogations of the accused. This evidence will disclose that the Chief Cabinet Secretary could neither voice his opinion nor vote in the Cabinet meeting but was concerned primarily with work of an administrative character. This witness will testify that HOSHINO never attended the Liaison Conference while President of the Planning Board. Later, as Chief Cabinet Secretary he did attend but it was in a secretarial capacity only and he could not participate in the discussions or decisions.

Before, however, going into the evidence meeting the general issues in the Indictment, we should like to take up a collateral issue which was raised during the prosecution's case when a copy of certain

excerpts of interviews or interrogations of Mr.

HOSHINO by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey was offered in evidence against him. At that time objection to the document was made by Mr. Howard, acting in the absence of this counsel, who pointed out that the accused HOSHINO was led to believe that the statements made by him would not be used against him and challenged the accuracy of the document. The answer of the Tribunal to this objection as given by the President at page 5,153 of the transcript was as follows:

"A majority of the Court seems to be of the opinion that any challenge to this interrogation should come when the defense are giving their evidence and then you can meet it with your evidence, if you so desire. You will be giving evidence in rebuttal. In the meantime, the evidence is admitted subject to challenge in that way at that time."

Accordingly, this exhibit will be challenged by the testimony of persons who were present at these interviews.

We call as our first witness Dr. Spinks.

1	CHARLES NELSON SPINKS, called as
2	a witness on behalf of the defense, being first
3	duly sworn, testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:
6	Q Dr. Spinks, will you state your name and
7	address to the Tribunal, please?
8	A My name is Charles Nelson Spinks; my present
9	address is with the Civil Intelligence Section in
10	Tokyo.
11	MR. G. WILLIAMS: I ask that the witness be
12	shown defense document No. 2584.
13	(Whereupon, a document was handed
14	to the witness.)
15	Q Will you state whether or not that is your
16	affidavit?
17	A That is my affidavit.
18	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
19	A The content thereof is true and correct.
20	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence
21	defense document No. 2584, the affidavit of the wit-
22	ness, Dr. Spinks.
23	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
24	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2584

_

25

will receive exhibit No. 3207.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3207 and received in evidence.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I read the affidavit:

"My name is Charles Nelson Spinks. I am
presently employed as a War Department civilian
employee in Tokyo. In the autumn of 1945 I was a
Lieutenant Commander in the United States Naval
Reserve and was in Tokyo as Chief of the Manpower,
Food and Civilian Supplies Division of the United
States Strategic Bombing Survey.

"I understand and speak Japanese and was present at several of the interviews between Japanese and the Bombing Survey. Our purpose was to find out the effects of warfare on the Japanese economy and industry, particularly the effects of aerial bombing. We found that many of the Japanese whom we interviewed were reluctant to talk to us since they did not know our purpose and thought we might be investigating war criminal responsibility. It was necessary, therefore, to put them at their ease and reassure them that this was not our purpose and that we wanted information for Bombing Survey purposes only.

"I cannot say whether or not any of the Japanese interviewed were made positive promises or

2 3

assurances that the interviews would not be used against them in any war crimes prosecution, although they might well have gotten that impression from the preliminary remarks I witnessed. One of our members usually had a preliminary conversation with the interviewee to put him at ease and explain our aim so that he would speak freely during the interview. Certainly we exerted whatever efforts were necessary in the circumstances to allay suspicion and overcome any reluctance to give us the information we desired.

"I was present at the interviews with HOSHINO, Naoki, during November, 1945. HOSHINO was not placed under oath and the interrogations were conducted in a friendly and informal atmosphere. The only interpreter was a missionary, much overworked, whose Japanese was good, although he often needed help from me in translating technical terms. I have been shown by counsel exhibit No. 454 for identification --"

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

MR. G. WILLIAIS (Reading Continued): "--which is a transcript of the Bombing Survey interviews with HOSHINO in November, 1945. I would say that this

. 2

. 3

3

6

5

9

10

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

30

21

22

24

transcript is accurate so far as the questions put to HOSHINO are concerned. It does not, however, contain the preliminary remarks at the beginning of the interviews, nor does it contain an exact or full record of HOSHINO's answers to the questions.

"When asked a question. HOSHINO often spoke for several minutes at a time, sometimes as long as five minutes, before his remarks were translated. I could not always follow him or retain the full substance of his longer replies, and the same was true of the interpreter. In such cases the interpreter translated as much as he could remember, or gave the gist of the answer to the stemographer. Sometimes we had to go over the answers after the interview in order to edit them, correct passages, or fill in portions which had been missed, or where the exact words or sentences had been forgotten. I recall that several times during the interview HCSHINO attempted to make corrections, but so far as I know HOSHINO was not shown the final transcripts after editing and corrections were made following the interviews.

"There was only one stenographer to record the interviews. Neither the interpreter nor the stenographer was sworn.

"/S/ CHARLES NELSON SPINKS"

You may cross-examine. THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

v	1
K	
a	2
p i e	
_	3
9	
a	4

&	5
K	6
n	
Kna	7
D	
p	8
1	
	9
	••
	10
	11
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	11
	18
	•
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

CHARLES NELSON SPINKS, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, we present language corrections for exhibit 3198, line 7, and exhibit 3202 which was presented Monday but not read into the transcript. The portions underscored, as depicted, indicate revisions as made by the Arbitration Board. The approved translations only will be read; major alterations will be indicated in the reading.

Exhibit 3198 (defense document 2044), record page 28,918, line 4, delete from "but in my" to the end of the page and substitute "but my Cabinet completely disregarded such a thing.

"War Minister Hata fully understood and wholeheartedly cooperated in this policy of my Cabinet."

Paragraph 6 of the first translation:

SPINKS 29,078

"However a conspiracy arose to overthrow my
Cabinet. A good plan for the conspirators was to have
General HATA, who was opposed to the Tripartite Pact,
resign, thus overthrow the Cabinet and kill two birds
with one stone. Finally this plan was carried out.
When I received General HATA's resignation, I believed
that he was forced to resign, not of his own will, but
through outside forces. I am today still convinced
that this was so."

Paragraph 7 of the English translation:

Record page 28,919, line 1, before "I asked"

insert "On the 16th of July 1940."

Line 12, -- in the original English translation the last line on page 1 -- delete from "consequently" to the end of the next paragraph and
substitute "and he felt the responsibility. Knowing
General HATA's feelings, after the resignation of the
Cabinet en bloc, I called him into my room and shaking his hand said, in general, 'I can understand your
feelings. You have suffered much. I do not blame
you.' He smiled sadly. His situation was indeed
pitiful.

"General HATA, as far as I know, was never connected with any clique, association or organization while in the army or in politics. He, of

SPINKS 29,079

course, never belonged to any aggressive or ultramilitaristic organization. In fact he scrupulously avoided politics."

If the Tribunal please, I had hoped to present exhibit 3202 but it has not come to me from the mimeographers and I beg the indulgence of the Tribunal to present it when it has been prepared.

THE PRESIDENT: Exhibit 3198 should be read as corrected.

Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: If the Tribunal would be pleased, I would read the corrected affidavit when we present the corrected TANAKA affidavit; that is, at a later date, sir. Or I will accept any suggestion that the Tribunal has.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being it need not be read.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, could we have some reasonable time set so that we will not have parts of these individual defenses bridging over, gapping, so that we could have them in final form?

THE PRESIDENT: I endeavored to have these things read before the accused HATA's case was closed this morning. I desired to avoid a waste of time involved in adjourning then.

MR. KEENAN: I am merely suggesting, Mr.

President, that if the changes are very few and if it takes, say, by the end of tomorrow, some appropriate time could be fixed so that we would have a schedule of continued movement of this case in closing these individual cases as the occasion permits; it would

THE PRESIDENT: We are largely in the hands of the ...nguage Section, but these two documents should be read as soon as they are available, and we urge expedition.

Brigadier Quilliam.

be helpful to orderly procedure.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, so that I be not mitsunderstood, I have not reference to any language changes. I have reference to the TANAKA affidavit. It does not involve language changes.

THE PRESIDENT: We still urge expedition in respect to that matter, Mr. Chief of Counsel.

Mr. Lazarus saw me in Chambers during the luncheon adjournment and suggested that he put the affidavit, if I may call it such, in the form of question and answer to save time. I said the Court, I was are, would accept anything to save time.

Brigadier Quilliam.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY BRIGADIER QUILLIAM:

Q Witness, am I right in assuming that you are unable to say whether, in fact, the preliminary statements referred to by you in your affidavit were actually made to HOSHINO?

A I cannot recall the exact words which were said to Mr. HOSHINO, but I am positive that he was given some kind of assurance and some explanation as to the objectives of the Bombing Survey; that is, what --

THE INTERPRETER: Mr. Witness, please go on.

- Q Are you positive from your recollection, Witness?
 - A I am positive from my recollection.
- Q Do you realize that you did not say that in your affidavit? Do you realize that your affidavit in this respect is cast in general language and refers to a practice?

A It was the practice before the interviewees to give a preliminary discussion explaining the objectives of the survey, and I am positive that a similar discussion -- and I am sure that in the case of Mr. HOSHINO a similar preliminary discussion took place.

4

2

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

1	Q Can you be sure, Witness, that you are not
2	relying merely on the practice? Can you be sure that
3	you can recollect such a thing?
4	A I believe I can be sure because the inter-
5	view with Mr. HOSHINO was the first one I attended.
6	Q How many interviews were there?
7	A There were three.
8	Q Do you say that this warning, or this state-
9	ment, was made before each interview?
10	A It is my recollection that it was made at
11	the first meeting with Mr. HOSHINO.
12	Q And not at the others?
13	A I do not recall the others.
14	Q And as I understand it, you are unable to
15	assist the Tribunal by saying precisely what was said?
16	A I cannot remember the exact words, what was
17	said.
18	Q Who made the statement?
19	A I cannot recall exactly. It was probably
20	one of the interrogators or possibly the chairman of
21	the committee of the group.
22	Q Do you understand the Japanese language?
23	A I have some knowledge of it.
24	Q Now, you have looked, you tell us, at these
25	interrogations, exhibit 454, recently?

Г	plane : 1200 (전경) 전경 (전경) [120] [11] (전경) [12] (전경) (전경) (전경) (전경) (전경) (전경) (전경) (전경)
1	Q Can you point to any answer which is inexact?
2	A I don't believe I can.
3	Q Can you point to any answer which is incom-
4	plete?
5	A I think almost every answer except the yes-
6	or-no replies was incomplete.
7	O Do you suggest that any of those answers was
8	incomplete in a material respect?
9	A I cannot say at this time; I have forgotten.
10	Q Can you indicate in any instance where a
11	correction was asked for by HOSHINO and it was not made?
12	A No, I cannot.
13	THE PRESIDENT: Did you hear the answers read
14	over to the accused?
15	THE WITNESS: That is, during the interroga-
16	tion?
17	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
18	THE WITNESS: The answers, except for one or
19	two, were not read back to the accused as far as I can
20	recall.
21	Q May we assume that this duty you were engaged
22	upon was an important one?
23	
24	
25	

1	gation should be substantially accurate?
2	A The survey had a very limited time in Japan
3	and was under great pressure.
4	Q Will you please answer my question?
5	A Will you repeat it?
6	O My question was, May we not assume that it
7	was important that this record should be an accurate
8	record of the proceedings?
9	A That is right.
10	Q Can you point to anything in that document
11	which would indicate that it is not in fact an accur-
12	ate record?
13	A I cannot do so.
14	BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: That is all.
15	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams.
16	
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:
19	Q Doctor Spinks, was that record taken by the
20	Strategic Bombing Survey accurate for the purpose for
21	which it was taken?
	A Yes, it was.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: We have no further questions,
23	if your Honor please.
14	

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the

usual terms.
(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
Fig Color Accidents St. 1208
the second of Tales a special agency substituted by
FRANCIS R. MILLARD, called as a
witness on behalf of the defense, being first
duly sworn, testified as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q Will you tell the Tribunal your name and occu-
pation, please?
A My name is Francis R. Millard. I am a mission
ary. orderication as he to temperate with the work Y
MR. WILLIAMS: May the witness be shown defens
document No. 2591?
(Whereupon, a document was handed to the
witness.)
O Will you look that document over and state
whether or not that is your affidavit?
A It is.
Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
A So far as I know, yes.
MR. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence defense
document No. 2591, the affidavit of the witness Mr.

Millard.

3

5

7 8

10

9

11 12

14

15

13

16 17

18

20

22

21

23

25

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2591

will receive exhibit No. 3208.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3208 and received in evidence.)

MR. WILLIAMS: I shall read the affidavit.

"I, Francis R. Millard, am an American Missionary to Japan, residing at number 171 Amanuma, 1 Chome, Suginami-ku, Tokyo.

"I was formerly connected with the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, serving in Japan with that organization as an interpreter after the war. I was the only interpreter during the interviews held with Naoki HOSHINO on the 19, 22, and 28 of November, 1945.

"Before the first of those interviews I was instructed, as was our practice, to talk with HOSHINO and put him at his ease, explaining to him that the only purpose of the Bombing Survey was to get general information on the economic effects of the war on Japan, and to reassure him that the interview had no connection with any war crimes prosecution purposes nor the fixing of individual responsibility. It had been discovered that such assurance was considered necessary in order to get from the Japanese the information we needed.

This I did.

"Neither I nor the stenographer was sworn.

For the purposes of the Bombing Survey, it was sufficient if we took down the gist of the conversation rather than a verbatim record, in order to get the broad, overall picture.

"I have been shown Exhibit No. 454 for identification" -- I ask the Marshal to show that exhibit to the witness.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

(Continuing) "which is a copy of the interviews we had with Mr. HOSHINO. As far as the questions put to him go, it appears to be a verbatim record. As to the answers, however, the words are in many cases my own, or the answers are condensations of what HOSHINO said. He often spoke continuously for several minutes in response to a question and I gave no running translation. From time to time I received help on technical terms, particularly from one of the observers at the interviews who spoke Japanese. I had been away from Japan for several years and found such technical assistance necessary.

"This document does not show the statements made to HOSHINO before the formal interview, and, as I

4

1

5

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

recall, is not a complete record of the conversation in other respects. HOSHINO understood some English and suggested corrections from time to time, although I can not say whether or not all corrections were actually made. Neither HOSHINO nor I got a chance to read the transcript afterwards and, in fact, I never saw it until it was recently shown to me.

"Signed: Francis R. Millard."

time the enter the way compliance mufficulty

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

G	1
r	
	1
е	2
6	
n	3
	-
b	
0	4
r	
	5
g	A S
	3370
&	6
- CONT. 14	7
В	,
a	
	8
r	
t	9
2	
200	10
	382
	11
	11
	12
	13
	13
	14
	15
	1)
	100
	16
	17
	1/

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY BRIGADIER QUILLIAM:

Q Witness, will you please tell the Tribunal exactly what you said to Mr. HOSHINO, I mean by way of preliminary statements, of course.

A I do not remember my exact words, sir. The intent, of course, as given in the affidavit, was to explain to him that the purpose of the survey was simply to get an over-all picture and didn't concern individual responsibility nor connection with the warfare.

Q Can you actually recollect making a statement of that kind to HOPHINO?

A Yes, sir.

Q How many times was he interviewed?

A I was at three interviews.

Did you make the statement each time or only on the first occasion?

A I can't say, sir, but I would think at the first time only. It was considered sufficient.

Q Did you assist at the interrogation of other persons than HOPHINO?

A Yes, sir.

Q Many of them?

A There were several.

1	Q Can you give me any idea how many?
2	A I was in on many interviews. On this level,
3	I suppose, there were six or seven.
4	Q Will you tell us who instructed or author-
5	ized you to make a statement of this kind?
6	A The chairman in charge of the interview.
7	0 Who was that in this case?
8	A I don't recall, sir, who held the rank. I
9	think Mr. Bisson led out in the interview and prob-
10	ably so instructed me.
11	Q But you cannot be sure about it.
12	A No, sir.
13	Q Now, the questions, I understand, appearing
14	in that record that's been shown to you are verbatim
15	according to your recollection?
16	A I think so.
17	n Now, would you indicate those answers in
18	that record which you say are your own.
19	(To the Tribunal) May the record be handed
20	to the witness, if it please the Tribunal?
21	(Whereupon, a document was handed
22	to the witness.)
23	' A In a sense they are all mine.
24	Q Well, you distinguish in your affidavit be-
25	tween answers which are yours and those instances

-

where you have given a condensation. Will you point out an example of each?

A The words are mine, the answers are his.

I don't know that I could pin that down, sir. It
would depend on the length of them. The short
answers, of course, are as verbatim as they can be
when translated.

Q Can you point to an instance where a correction was asked for by HOSHINO?

A That would not show in the record, and I wouldn't remember them.

Q May I assume that whenever HOFHINO asked you to make a correction you made it; I mean you didtated it?

A Very often, in order to clear up points, there was a conversation between the one being interrogated and the interpreter, and we cleared up points which I then passed on in the answer. However, there were times when Mr. HOSHINO, in attempting to follow the English, thought I had deviated, and more often than not a mere explanation was all it took to satisfy him.

Q In other words, Mr. Millard, you did your best to see that that record was an accurate, reliable record of the discussion.

A I believe that it is.

Q So far as you know, there is nothing in that record which could be called unfair to HOSHINO?

MR. G. WILLIAMS: If your Honor please, we should like to object and have that question qualified as to the purpose for which the Brigadier is asking it: the accuracy.

THE PRESIDENT: As I understand the Brigadier, by "unfair" he means "inaccurate."

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: I meant to go further, sir, and suggest to the witness -- and, indeed, the witness has told us -- that he did his best to be fair to the accused by giving full account to any corrections suggested by him.

THE PREFIDENT: In other words, that he tried to give as accurate a translation as he could.

Your Honor, was merely the form of asking the witness' conclusions as to the accuracy of the document presumably for all purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is directed to discovering whether the answers were accurately taken down in English and is allowed.

A I didn't take the answers down, sir, but I think I interpreted them as fairly as I could.

	Q	I am	sure y	ou did	. This	is the	point,	isn't
it,	wit	ness:	you h	ad a d	uty, no	t only	to the	Bombing
sur	vey	author	rities	but a	duty to	HOSHIN	o, and	to the
bes	t of	your	abilit	y you	dischar	ged bot	h those	duties;
is	that	not	50?					

A I attempted.

Q And you have told us you can't point to any respect in which the document is inaccurate or incomplete although you say it doesn't contain all the words used by HOSHINO?

A As I understand it, that refers to the preliminary remarks, which are not recorded, prior to the actual interview.

THE PRESIDENT: The preliminary remarks were yours, not HOSHINO's. You must have known we are talking about the reporting or the translating of HOSHINO's observations.

Q Witness, have you any doubt but that that record is in all material respects accurate?

A From the standpoint of interpreter, I have no reason to doubt it.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: Thank you.
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:

Q Mr. Millard, you stated that from the standpoint of interpreter you have no reason to doubt the accuracy of that record.

A I say ascurate within the terms with which we are approaching this. That is, we admit that it, many times, was a gist rather than a verbatim report, and to that extent it is accurate.

Q And you say that the condensation was fair for your purposes, is that correct?

A Yes.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I have no further questions. I ask the witness be released.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was ex-

cused.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: Now, may it please the Tribunal, on the basis of the evidence which has been received, first as to the fact that these statements were elicited from the accused for an entirely different purpose than that of prosecution and that he was led to believe that they were not to be used against him for war crimes prosecution purposes, thereby

that the document is not a verbatim transcript of the answers of the accused to the questions asked him but is, instead, in many cases the words of the interpreter and the condensation of the accused's answers: third, the fact that the accused was not given the transcript to look over despite the fact that he had attempted to make corrections; for these reasons we herewith move that exhibit No. 454A, composed of excerpts of Strategic Bombing furvey interposed of the accused HOSHINO and all matters pertaining theretoo be struck from evidence and disregarded by the Tribunal.

To the best of my knowledge, and I think the prosecution will bear me out in this statement,
HOSHINO is the only one of the accused whose interrogation by the strategic Bombing furvey was introduced against him. I am prepared, and I should like, to make further arguments on these points if the Tribunal will hear me.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, under the British
system the police interrogating suspects are to warn
them that anything they say may be used in evidence,
and, if that isn't done, the jury are warned against
convicting. But this isn't the British system. This

is an international system. Of course, these interrogators were not police, as far as we know; they
were interrogating for a different purpose. But,
apparently, they did give some kind of assurance
that the evidence would not be used here, and the
question arises as sharply in the one case as in the
other, but it is a matter for the whole Tribunal.

R. G. WILLIAMS: I should like to make this argument briefly, if I may, your Honor. It is not long.

Language Section, I am now referring to argument marked "1."

On the first point of what is, we submit, an unfair use of these interrogatories, we do not deem it necessary to dwell at length. Suffice it to say that what eventually resulted in being a misleading assurance was given to the accused. Despite the fact that this evidence does not spell out an exact and specific promise in so many words, there is, nevertheless, an implied promise to that effect, more particularly so when viewed in the light that what we have here is a case of a Japanese being questioned, two and one-half months after the surrender, by military and other representatives of one of the victorious powers, with all the other factors necessarily present in such cir-

cumstances.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the esecond point, we submit that it is fundamental that the answers to the interrogatories of an accused when placed before a court in any form must be accurate and complete, just as he made them, and in the words which he himself used. This is particularly true when he has been questioned directly along the lines for which he is later prosecuted. This is not like the case of the interrogation of the accused by the prosecution where the interpreters and stenographers were sworn and the transcripts appear to be verbatim. Here, besides the use of excerpts, we have the additional factor lending to unreliability of a condensation of many of the accused's answers and in the words of the interpreter, not to mention the fact that the misleading assurance also lends to unreliability.

These points are given more weight because of the fact that the accused did not have an opportunity to read the transcript although he tried to make corrections.

For these reasons we submit that the use of these interrogatories for the purposes of this Tribunal is both unreliable and unfair, and they should, therefore, be struck from evidence. THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, I wish to make it quite clear at the outset that if the Tribunal considers that there would be any possibility of unfairness toward the accused in using these interrogations the prosecution certainly will not attempt to press for their use. May I be permitted to say that these interrogations were handed to the prosecution without any restriction on their use or without any intimation that any undertaking had been given in respect of them. The prosecution, as the Tribunal will no doubt readily realize, has been given great concern since these affidavits were served in order to decide what would be the proper procedure to adopt. It was decided that we 'ad a duty to all concerned to question the witnesses and find out as clearly and as precisely as we could find out just what happened. Under the circumstances, we feel that it would probably be better if we did not argue the matter unless, of course, the Tribunal wishes us to do so. There has now been placed before the Tribunal all the information that we have on the matter, and we would be quite happy to let the Tribunal decide as the matter stands at present.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will consider the matter. Mr. Williams. MR. G. WILLIAMS: We shall leave that matter and go on to the next evidence, calling as our next witness, ISHIWATA, sotaro. SOTARO ISHIWATA, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. G. WILLIAMS: itness, will you tell the Tribunal your name and address, please. Name, ISHIWATA, Sotaro; address, 455 Feijomachi, Fetagaya-ku, Tokyo. MR. G. WILLIAMS: May the witness be handed defense document No. 2521, please? (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

whether or not it is your affidavit? This is my affidavit.

Are the contents therein true and correct?

Would you examine that document and state

They are true and correct. A

MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence defense document No. 2521, the affidavit of the witness ISHIWARA.

THE PRESIDENT: ^dmitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2521

will receive exhibit No. 3209.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3209 and received in evidence.)

Reichers & Yelden

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I shall read the affidavit, omitting the formal parts on page 1 and the top of page 2:

"Mr. HOSHINO was a junior student at the Tokyo Imperial University one year behind me. After he entered the Finance Ministry, he was my colleague in the Revenue Bureau of the Ministry as well as in the Osaka Revenue Inspection Bureau for many years. I was particularly intimate with him so that even on his personal affairs he asked my advice without reserve.

"In June, 1932, the Manchurian government asked the Finance Ministry to send the former a person appropriate to assist its Department of Finance in the execution of its affairs. Finance Minister TAKAHASHI thought it imperative that a man of excellent ability should by all means be sent. So after consulting Mr. KURODA, Hideo, Vice-Minister of Finance and Mr. ONO, Ryuta, Chief of the Private Secretariat Section, he selected Mr. HOSHINO. Hence it may be said that the nomination of Mr. HOSHINO was originated from the intention of the Finance Ministry authorities. Mr. HOSHINO, when approached by Mr. ONO in this regard however, strongly rejected this offer because of the illness of his father (HOSHINO, Kota, a well-known

. 22

Christian minister in Japan) and of some other family circumstances. In accordance with the request of Chief ONO of the Private Secretariat Section to urge Mr. HOSHINO to accept his new post, I called at Mr. HOSHINO's residence and, having an interview with some members of his family as well as him, I persuaded him to take the government offer. At last Mr. HOSHINO made up his mind to accept the offer. In July he resigned his post in the Finance Ministry, and went over to Manchukuo to enter the civil service of the Manchukuo government.

"Through my official negotiations with
Mr. HOSHINO, which were carried on in the Finance
Ministry and according to my experience during my trip
to Manchukuo, I knew that Mr. HOSHINO, after taking
his post in the Manchukuo government, had wholeheartedly exerted himself to promote the welfare of the people
of Manchukuo. As far as I can remember, whenever he
regarded any Japanese policy toward Manchukuo as
adverse to the interests of the people of Manchukuo,
he did everything in his power to prevent it from being
carried out. At one time he persistently insisted
that, in the interests of the people of Manchukuo,
Japan relinquish special rights and interests she had
enjoyed so far. In order to realize his projected

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

plan, he frequently visited the Finance Ministry, presenting many a demand to it. In 1935, for example, he sharply criticized controversial issues, such as the raising of tariffs on agricultural products of Manchukuo and the prohibition of the importation of apples produced in Manchukuo, and urged the Finance Ministry to bring the issues to a conclusion as it saw fit. In addition, he stressed the necessity of relinquishing extraterritorial rights and the executive powers vested in the railway zone authorities. At one time he visited the Finance Ministry and insisted that, in the event of the relinquishment of these, the Japanese installations be transferred to Manchukuo at prices as cheap as possible and especially public facilities be transferred without compensation. Such an attitude as his led some persons to criticize him as laying too much stress on the interests of Manchukuo at the expense of those of Japan.

"I do not know well the circumstances under which Mr. HOSHINO took part in the Second KONOYE Cabinet. However, immediately after the general resignation of the YONAI Cabinet took place, Prince KONOYE rang me up, asking for my opinion as to the advisability of appointing Mr. HOSHINO as Director of the Cabinet Planning Board. In reply to it, I said that I considered him

•

19

20

21

23

24

1	to be fit for the post in view of his practical experi-
2	ence in that line of business."
3	You may cross-examine.
4	THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.
5	MR. QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal,
6	there will be no cross-examination.
7	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We ask that the witness be
8	released on the usual terms.
9	THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.
10	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
11	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We call as our next witness
12	MATSUKI, Tamotsu.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TAMOTSU MATSUKI, recalled as a
2	witness on behalf of the defense, having been
3	previously sworn, testified through Japanese
4	interpreters as follows:
5	THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former
6	oath.
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:
9	Q Witness, will you tell the Tribunal your
10	name and address, please?
11	A My name is MATSUKI, Tamotsu; my address:
12	No. 1731 4-chome, Fukasawa-cho, Setagaya Ward, Tokyo.
13	MR. G. WILLIAMS: May the witness be shown
14	defense document No. 2526?
15	Q Will you examine that document and state
16	whether or not it is your affidavit?
17	A This is my affidavit.
18	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
19	A They are correct.
20	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence defense
21	document No. 2526, the affidavit of the witness
22	MATSUKI.
23	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
24	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2526

will receive exhibit No. 3210.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3210 and received in evidence.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: Omitting the formal parts
I read the affidavit beginning at the top of page 2:

"As shown in my public career described above, I attended the business of the General Affairs Board as, alternately, the Chief of the Secretariat, the Chief of the Legislative and the Vice-Chief of the General Affairs Board, directly under HOSHINO, Naoki, the Chief of the General Affairs Board.

"(1) The Chief of the General Affairs
Board in Manchukuo is the one who renders assistance
to the premier and who exercises general control over
the business of the General Affairs Board which comes
under the premier's direct superintendance. He is,
therefore, not competent to decide state affairs.

Even the decision of routine matters of the General
Affairs Board, with the exception of trifling ones
entrusted in him only by the law such as the appointment and dismissal, reward and punishment of those
below the clerical staff of the Board, was made by
the premier himself and not at the discretion of the
chief of the General Affairs Board.

"(2) At the end of 1936 Chief of the

.

4 5

General Affairs Board ODATE resigned his post and Mr. HOSHINO was appointed to the post as his successor. The reasons why he assumed that post were as follows:

"Firstly, as about five years had passed since Manchukuo was founded, it was deemed suitable to appoint some one to the post of Chief of the General Affairs Board from those who were in actual service in Manchukuo rather than the usual out-of-date practice of selecting a person from Japanese officials from Japan.

"Secondly, Manchukuo had passed into the period of economic construction from that of 'peace first' and became in need of an able financier and economist who should take the lead of the Board and render assistance to the premier. It was, therefore, in the light of the need mentioned above that Mr. HOSHINO who, of all the government officials in Manchukuo, had been connected with the state finance and economy, was newly appointed Chief of the General Affairs Board on the recommendation of his predecessor and the premier.

"(3) All the preceding chiefs of the General Affairs Board had duly observed the limits of their office, and Chief of the General Affairs Board HOSHINO

especially attended to his business, in obedience to Premier Chao's direction and decision, rigidly within the limits of his duty. It was a matter of course that, as far as I knew, he had never decided anything on behalf of the premier.

"(4) Under Chief HOSHINO, two assistant' chiefs, one Japanese and the other Manchurian, jointly took charge of the affairs. For important items of state affairs, however, Mr. HOSHINO used to call up two assistant chiefs, namely myself and Mr. Ku Tzu-hsiang, the Manchurian assistant chief, and to deliberate on the matter for decision. There were no important matters that were decided without consultation with the Manchurian assistant chief.

opinions of Manchurians, especially those of youthful Manchurian officials, and he was ever mindful of the promotion of superior Manchurian officials.

Accordingly, important posts at the General Affairs Board such as the Private Secretary of the Chief of the Board, the Assistant Chief of the Board, the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, the Chief of the General Affairs Section of the Secretariat, etc. which had hitherto been occupied by the Japanese officials were replaced by the Manchurian officials in rapid

succession. He held Manchurians in such regard that the accusation that the Chief HOSHINO over-valued the intentions of Manchurians was voiced in some Japanese quarters.

"(6) With regard to the salaries for officials of the Sennin and Inin Ranks (similar to the Japanese Sonin and Hannin Ranks, respectively), there had hitherto been some discrimination between the Japanese and the Manchurians. This was due to an allowance, the sum equivalent to between 40 to 80 percent of salaries, which had been additionally paid to the Japanese officials. This was because of the high cost of living of Japanese compared with Manchurians, as there was a difference between them in their ways of living. In 1938, Chief HOSHINO removed this discrimination and gave equal treatment to both Japanese and Manchurians.

"(7) As a matter of course, there never was a case in which the Kwantung Army dictated to the General Affairs Board, although the wishes of the Army were laid before the Board sometimes. On such occasions Chief HOSHINO took the necessary measures under the direction of the respective authorities after consulting with the government organs concerned as well as the Prime Minister. Even the wishes of the

Kwantung Army laid before the Board, if they were considered not to be appropriate, were not followed. For instance, when the renovation of the administrative organization was effected in June, 1937, and the Department of Public Peace was formed amalgamating the Department of Military Affairs and the Bureau of Police Affairs in the Department of People's Welfare, a proposal was submitted by the Kwantung Army to have a man from the military ranks appointed as vice minister of the new department. Against this, Chief HOSHINO first consulted us and recommended Mr. SUSUKIDA, Yoshitomo of the civil officials as the candidate, disregarding the desire of the Kwantung Army. Eventually he was appointed as the vice minister.

"Notwithstanding the fact that Chief of
General Affairs HOSHINO not only was all the time
paying attention to the stabilization of the national
life of the Manchurian people but also to elevating
their economic life, he was always concerned about
their afflictions and so assumed a cautious attitude,
for commodities gradually became more scarce and
consequently economic control stricter, by degrees,
as a result of the European war and subsequent to the
outbreak of the Sino-Japanese Incident, half a year
after assuming his office. Such being the case, he

was usually making efforts to negotiate with the 1 Japanese government and others, so that Manchukuo 2 might sell the food, as well as other goods that were exported from her, as dearly as possible on the one hand, while on the other she might as profitably and abundantly as possible purchase the necessaries of life and other commodities that were im-7 ported into the country. Furthermore, there were instances such as in the case of salt, the most necessary food ingredient for the populace, where the 10 government even reduced prices and distributed it 11 to the people, although other prices were going up 12 13 step by step. 14 "(Signed) MATSUKI, Tamotsu." 15 You may cross-examine. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam. 17 BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the 18 Tribunal, we do not desire to cross-examine. 19 MR. G. WILLIAMS: We ask that the witness be released on the usual terms. 21 THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly. 22 (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 23 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was

20

24

Duda & Spratt

. 1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams, the Tribunal by a majority dismisses your motion.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: If the Tribunal pleases, Dr. KANZAKI, I believe, wishes to take up some matter briefly.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, Dr. KANZAKI is ready at this time to read the corrected copy of exhibit 2303.

of ADDA, Kanza

hald, relactionly, or adjourn

THE PRESIDENT: 3202.

De. KANZAKI.

MR. KANZAKI: The revised affidavit of NODA,
Kengo, exhibit 3202, has arrived, but upon consultation
with the prosecution we ask the Tribunal's permission
to read this affidavit together with the certificate
covering the letter from Prince KANIN, Chief of General
Staff, mentioned in the testimony of the witness
SAWADA, as well as the revised affidavit of the witness
TANAKA on Friday morning.

The witness NODA is now waiting in the witness room. I ask for the Tribunal's direction as to whether the affidavit of the witness NODA, Kengo should be read now or whether we should wait until Friday so

that we may lump them all together.

THE PRESIDENT: You have given no reason desarrow Liberareture to Tallows for not reading it now.

MR. KANZAKI: Your Honor, we have no preference in the matter. We are quite ready to proceed now with the reading or to wait until Friday, whichever suits the convenience of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: We want all these matters to be dealt with together; but is not that possible now?

MR. KANZAKI: At the present moment we are only prepared to read the affidavit of NODA, Kengo.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, reluctantly, we adjourn the matter until Friday, the completion of this particular part until Friday. We expect you to deal with all those outstanding matters in the HATA case on Friday morning.

> MR. KANZAKI; Thank you, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: If the Tribunal please, we call as our next witness TAKAKURA, Tadashi.

21 addition on the usual barbara

(Whome now, the decision about The

ferred to was merked defense establit No. 3211

23 24

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

TAD.	SHI TAKAKURA, called as a witness
on	behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
te	stified through Japanese interpreters as follow
	· DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR.	G. WILLIAMS:
Q	Witness, will you state to the Tribunal your
name ar	d residence.
A	My name, TAKAKURA, Tadashi; my address,
No. 57	Otsukanakacho, Koishikawa, Bunkyoku, Tokyo;
my age,	45.
perted	MR. G. WILLIAMS: May the witness be shown
defense	document No. 2527.
Q	I ask you to examine that document and state
whether	or not that is your affidavit.
deliv.	This is my affidavit.
Q	Are the contents thereof true and correct?
A	They are true and correct.
nesaly	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence
defense	document 2527, the affidavit of the witness
TAKAKU	A. the Denital Trains Board. At that the the
contain.	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms:
	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2527
will re	eceive exhibit No. 3211.
and led	(Whereupon, the document above re-

ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3211

and received in evidence.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I shall read the affidavit, omitting the first long paragraph.

"A. The Manchoukuoan Government, in the 4th year of Kangte, namely on October 12, 1937, decided on the so-called 10-year program of opium prohibition.

I, at that time as Councillor of the Planning Board, assumed responsibility for drafting the said program, together with my colleague, Yung Shan-Chi.

period after its founding had been earnestly planning for eradication of the evil custom of smoking or eating opium, and, as a means first established a monopoly system for opium and administered the production, delivery and consumption of opium, thus adopting a policy for a decisive curtailment of opium consumption.

"Mr. HOSHINO, in the 3rd year of Kangte, namely, in December 1936, was transferred from his position of Vice-Chief of the Financial Department to Chief of the General Affairs Board. At that time the opium monopoly was already gaining impetus and was efficiently enforced. Mr. HOSHINO, however, as soon as he was made Chief of the General Affairs Board, called together many representative and serious Manchurian-born, young officials belonging to various

23

24

25

1

departments and had them conduct free discussions relating to the problem of the opium policy. This discussion was continued in earnest for several months and its conclusion was that Manchoukuo had already reached a mature time to enforce a positive prohibition policy. Most of the said young officials agreed that various necessary measures should be courageously taken as rapidly as possible for the drastic eradication of opium addicts. The free discussion by these native-born young officials created a considerably great sensation at that time in Manchuria and attracted the attention of the general public. In fact, among the Japanese-born officials there was a loud voice criticising Mr. HOSHINO's attitude as currying favour with native-born officials. Mr. HOSHINO, however, as soon as the report on the conclusion reached by these Manchurian-born officials was received, ordered us to map out, in collaboration with the various related departments, a program on the basis of the said report, to be enforced by the government. ber the total the possible or not.

"It is, however, not easy to eliminate completely the number of those poisoned by opium, who were estimated at more than 1,000,000 at the beginning of the national establishment of Manchukuo,

under very adverse conditions. It was the conclusion of the study of the persons in charge of practical opium work that even if every strong measure was taken, under these adverse conditions it would take as long as 20 years. Meanwhile, most of the prominent people and notables were expressing outwardly their approval of the prohibition policy, but they were secretly expressing their opposition against the drastic method, alleging that it was impossible. Then I informed Mr. HOSHINO of these matters and told him that it would take 20 years to achieve complete prohibition. Mr. HOSHINO tenaciously insisted upon the 10-year plan, and said that where there is a will there is a way, and the fruits could not be borne unless we endeavored to achieve the high objective. He admonished me that when the Manchurian youths were about to march on towards the ideal with fervor, the Japanese party should rejoice over the sincere enthusiasm of the Manchurian party and do our utmost in aiding them, rather than to worry ourselves in anticipation whether the goal was possible or not.

"Furthermore, Mr. HOSNINO said to the persons in the accounting section as follows: 'If the opium monopoly profit is appropriated as a source of revenue of the general annual expenditures, prohibition will

23 24

22

become difficult from the financial aspect. If it is used for the expenses of the prohibition policy, finances will not be affected even if the prohibition is carried out. At this time, therefore, make them carry out the necessary means for prohibition without stinting the expense. Don't worry about the decrease in the revenue due to the prohibition. There is no necessity that the opium revenue be used for the general expenses.'

"Thus, the draft, which I and Yung Shan-Chi wrote, based on the assertion of the Manchurian youth bureaucrats, came to be decided at last by the cabinet meeting, through the conferences and negotiations with each department concerned. This plan was put into effect in and after January, 1938. The central force that propelled this project during these periods was in fact nobody but Mr. HOSHINO and a group of Manchurian youth bureaucrats. Although the decision on this prohibition policy, including a drastic article that those governmental and public officials as well as the members of the special companies who did not refrain from opium smoking within a fixed period be dismissed, was a great menace to them, in which most of the high ranks were included, it was realized. The prudent persons among them were willing to take leave and undergo the treatment, one after another. Thus, the improvement at the beginning among the leading class was effected to a remarkable extent.

"At the same time, the government gave special consideration to regional prohibition in towns and cities. In towns and cities they made special efforts at registration, controlled relief, propaganda, etc., and the results in this field were also rapidly improved.

13 14

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

2

4 5

6

8

7

9

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

21

22

23

24

"Thus, the number of the registered opium addicts immediately before the end of war was reduced to something over 200,000.

"To cite an instance, you could hardly see an addict in Hsinking in 1944, so much so that all the sanitoriums there turned into lodging-houses for laborers.

"Mr. HOSHINO, at the outset of the foundation of Manchukuo, devoted himself to as well as contributed much towards the unification of the monetary system, the rationalization and establishment of both finance and economy and the abolition of extraterritoriality during the period from 1936 to 1937.

"In spite of the fact that prior to and after the establishment of Manchukuo, both the system and organization of her finance were at the extremity of chaos, Mr. HOSHINO, who came from Japan in the capacity of Chief of General Affairs of the Finance Department, succeeded in reforming them on short notice by means of his timely guidance and encouragement for his colleagues and men.

"Though unification of the monetary system had been regarded as particularly difficult, yet his strenuous efforts and enthusiasm led to success and monetary stability in August, 1935, less than three

years after the foundation of the state.

"The basis of the general economic development of Manchuria being formed by this, remarkable effects were brought about upon the stabilization and elevation of the living of the Manchurian people at large and the prosperity of the personal economy.

extremely disordered, utterly lacking in fairness, with a most reimitive financial system. The people at large were groaning under the burden of extremely heavy taxes. As an effective remedy for it, first the taxation system was reformed, aiming at the reduction of taxes of the people and the fairest taxation. The accounting system and financial organization were made up-to-date as well as fair and just, with the result that Manchukuo took her first step to present the appearance of a modern state and to have the substance as well. This was also generally attributed to Mr. HOSHINO's great enthusiasm and continuous efforts.

"As to the abolition of extraterritoriality in Manchukuo, Mr. HOSHINO harbored a most positive view. On this matter of abrogation of our extraterritoriality in Manchukuo, Japan did not necessarily agree with Manchukuo about the time and method of its execution. Especially, most Japanese residents in

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

Manchukuo who had much concern in the matter expressed the opinion that the time was still immature, which, reflecting upon the Japanese at home, gave rise in some circles of the governmental authorities to a view that they should take a cautious attitude toward it. However, Mr. HOSHINO, Chief of the General Affairs Section of the Finance Department at the time (later he became Vice-Chief of the Finance Lepartment) strongly advocated the prompt abrogation of extraterritoriality with a view to the sound development of Manchukuo and the impartial sharing of responsibility by the peoples of both Japan and Manchukuo, and he made efforts in persuading and negotiating with the authorities concerned. As a consequence, 'The Treaty Concerning the Residence of the Japanese Nationals in Manchukuo and the Taxes in Manchukuo, ' was first of all concluded in July 1936 (Kotoku 3). This treaty was of such a nature as to greatly increase the imposition of taxes upon the Japanese residents. Moreover, as I have said before, there existed much opposition and the argument for the prematureness of time for this procedure among the Japanese people on the spot. However, it was highly attributable to Mr. HOSHINO's sincere and zealous efforts that, despite such circumstances, the extraterritoriality was abolished upon the understanding

19 20

21

22

23 24

which was brought about by his persuasion of the discontented Japanese residents.

"Then Mr. HOSHINO took office as Director of the General Affairs Office. He exerted more strenuous efforts than ever to realize a complete abrogation of extraterritoriality and a complete transfer of the executive powers vested in the South Manchurian Railway Zone Authorities. Even so far as these issues were concerned, he had many difficulties to encounter. Particularly as to the abrogation of judiciary powers, many people in Japan held that it was still premature on the ground that the various systems and the executive and criminal facilities of Manchukuo were not completed as yet. While Mr. HOSHINO went to Japan and conferred with and negotiated with high government officials in order to overcome these difficulties, he took every occasion to persuade Japanese authorities on the spot to agree to his projected plan. There were cases where various authorities in charge of general affairs were deadlocked in their negotiations because of their division of opinion. On every such occasion, Mr. HOSHINO passed his own judgment on any matter from a broad point of view for the purpose of bringing negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion.

"Thus. 'The Treaty Concerning the Abrogation

1

. 3

4 5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

of Extraterritoriality in Manchukuo and the Transfer of the Executive Powers Vested in the South Manchurian Railway Company Zone Authorities' was put into effect as of December 1 of the same year. At that time, there arose a question as to whether the treaty should be put into effect as of December 1; some officials of the Manchukuo Government suggested that it be enforced rather as of January 1 of the following year in view of the necessity of making preparations for the enforcement of the treaty and the like. As far as I can remember, Mr. HOSHINO, opining that it had better be enforced as soon as possible, decided on the date of enforcement as of December 1.

"The abrogation of extraterritoriality resulted in abolishing the long-standing discriminative treatment between the Japanese and the Manchurian and in contributing greatly to the economic development of Manchukuo, not to mention the favorable psychological effect it had upon the Manchurians."

Signed, "TAKAKURA, Tadashi."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, we do not wish to cross-examine.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: May the witness be

	released on the usual terms? THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.
	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
	THE PRESCREATE Adulthed on the usual forms.
	CLEAR OF THE COURT: Volume I of the Inter-
	negation of HOSHING will receive exhibit bo. 1912 for
	downtriostion only. The excerpt therefrom, being
	efense becament 606-A-L, will receive exhibit No.
	(Wherepion, the document shore referred)
	to was marked defense exhibit No. 3212 for
	identifications the execut therefrom being
	marked defense exhibit No. 3212-A and received
	in eridence.)
	. BR. C. WILLIAMS. I shall rend the Tirat Page
	and three fourths of this decument down to "? Pebruary
	174/31
	PINTERHOGATION OF HORBING A NOTHER AND
	228 January 1946, page 32
	eq. What was the question about the cuty we
500000	tireffortal rights that you referred to back a little .
	ontle ago?
1	vi. This extratorrettantel right was entored
	by almost all nations of one fine, including the
	Japanese. Following the inflex of Japanese collection

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. G. WILLIAMS: We now offer in evidence defense cument No. 606-A-1, a group of excerpts from the prosecution's interrogations of HOSHINO.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Volume I of the Inter
pogation of HOSHINO will receive exhibit No. 3212 for

identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being

defense document 606-A-1, will receive exhibit No.

3212-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3212 for identification; the excerpt therefrom being marked defense exhibit No. 3212-A and received in evidence.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I shall read the first page and three fourths of this document down to "7 February 1946":

"INTERROGATION of HOSHINO - EXCERPTS

"28 January 1946, page 12

"Q. What was the question about the extraterritorial rights that you referred to back a little while ago?

"A. This extraterritorial right was enjoyed by almost all nations at one time, including the Japanese. Following the influx of Japanese colonists

into Manchukuo it was realized that the freedom of taxation injoyed by them would create inequality and an unfair state of affairs for the Chinese. And it was deemed necessary that this extraterritoriality should be abolished to equalize the situation. In the railway zone both Chinese and Japanese were not subject to taxation and this also was a situation that had to be remedied. You conducted the negotiations with the head of the Army, General UEDA, yourself, did you? 10 "A. I was one of those who conferred with 11 General UEDA. "Q. And who were the others? 13 "A. Mr. OHASHI, Vice Foreign Minister, was 14 another who conferred with General UEDA. 15

"Q. And you and the Vice Foreign Minister, Mr. OHAS I, suggested a plan for working this out, did you? If so, what was the plan?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"A. This was not exactly a plan, but a recommendation to be forwarded to the Japanese Government that steps be taken for the abolition of extraterritoriality in the railway zone.

"Q. What action did they take on that recommendation? That is the Japanese Government.

"A. Late in 1936 or early in 1937 as a result

of the Japan-Manchukuo Treaty, the desired result was obtained.

"Page 13

"Q. Was it necessary to take up with the head of the Kwantung Army all bond issues which were issued by Manchukuo? I am limiting it to this period of 1932 to 1936.

"A. It was not necessary to refer such matters to the Kwantung Army, but support was usually requested from this source.

over the period of 1932 to 1934 in which the Army, or the head of the Kwantung Army refused to give support?

"A. No. In 1935 bonds to the value of 140,000,000 yen were issued for the purchase of the North Manchuria Railway from the Soviet Government, at which time I came to Japan several times in connection with the flotation of these bonds.

"Q. And did you get the approval of the Kwantung Army in that case, too?

"A. It was not necessary for me to obtain the approval of the Kwantung Army. Rather than approval, it was the moral support as stated previously.

"Q. Did the Bureau take any action towards interesting people in making investments in Manchukuo

during this period 1932 to 1936? I mean did they take any action towards interesting people in developing industry in Manchukuo?

"A. Great efforts were made to sell shares of newly established companies amongst the population in Manchukuo.

"Q. Was it your department so far as the Manchukuo government was concerned that had charge of that during the period 1932 to 1936?

"A. This department was mainly concerned in a sort of sales campaign to have these shares held by as many people as possible.

"31 January 1946, page 17" --

This question and answer has been taken from prosecution exhibit 453-A, page 12.

"Q. What was the reason that the Kwantung Army made any objection to the Zaibatsu making investments in Manchukuo?

"A. The army in general did not oppose the Zaibatsu but there existed such an atmosphere among the Kwantung officers. The Kwantung officers believed that since the Zaibatsu monopolized industry in Japan such should not happen to the industries in Manchukuo. Therefore, the opposition on the part of the army.

"Q. How did you feel about it, Mr. HOSHINO?

. 1

Since I did not believe that the Zaibatsu "A. monopolized industry in Japan I felt that anyone could go into Manchukuo and make investments in industry. "Page 19 4 'Q. Did the Chinese Incident come as a surprise to you? would gow toll has letterial your "A. It was a surprise to me. "4 February 1946, page 3 S "Q. Was General HONJO in Manchuria when you 9 went there? 10 FILLIAMS: May the stream be handed Yes. "A. 11 "Q. State what conversations you had with 12 him about the Manchurian Incident in September 1931? 13 "A. I have never talked with General HONJO 14 concerning the Manchurian Incident. 15 "Q. Did you ever talk with General ITAGAKI? 16 "A. I have never talked with General ITAGAKI 17 concerning the Manchurian Incident." That is all I will read from this document at 19 present. 20 We call as our next witness MURAKAMI, Kyoichi. 21 THE PRESIDENT ABBITCH ON the BOURD COUNTY 22 RETAIN OF THE COURTY DECEMBE Continent 2073 23 24 (Whartowan, the document move perturned) 25

to wer served defense confitt No. 3211 and resilved

1	KYOICHI MURAKAMI, called as a witness
2	on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
3	testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:
6	Q Witness, would you tell the Tribunal your
1.7	name and address, please?
8	A My name is MURAKAMI, Kyoichi; my address 2546
9	Kichijoji, Musashino-machi, Kita Tama-gun, Tokyo.
10	MR. G. WILLIAMS: May the witness be handed
11	defense document No. 2073 (Revised)?
12	(Whereupon, a document was handed to
13	the witness.)
14	Q Will you examine that document and state whether
15	or not it is your affidavit?
16	A This is mine without a shadow of a doubt.
17	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
19	A They are truly true and correct.
20	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidenc defense
21	document No. 2073, the affidavit of the witness MURAKAMI.
22	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
23	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2073
24	will receive exhibit No. 3213.
5	(Whereupon, the document above referred
	to was marked defense exhibit No. 3213 and received

in evidence.)

MR. G. WILLIAMS: I shall read the affidavit, omitting formal parts:

"1. Those who held the seats in the Privy
Council were the President and Vice-President of the
Privy Council, Privy Councillors, Prime Minister and
State Ministers who were ministers of the respective
ministries. Besides the above, the adult Imperial
Princes of the Blood resident in Tokyo were also to
attend meetings of the Council by Imperial order. The
Princes, however, had never been present until I was
relieved of office at the Privy Council, although they
attended at the beginning when the institution of the
Council was set up.

"A State Minister, aside from the Prime Minister or a minister of a department, that is to say, a ministe without portfolio, had no seat at the Privy Council.

"Assistants of the Prime Minister and ministers of the departments, officials of the Cabinet and the Ministries were allowed to attend the Privy Council in order to assist the ministers in answering questions in the meeting. Ministers without portfolio often attended as 'explainers' also. There was no limit to the number of 'explainers', so they numbered at times more than ten. The 'explainers' were, as occasion demanded, able

when called upon and with the approval of the President, to supplement the explanation of the minister in charge. In fact, there were many occasions on which the 'explainers' spoke.

Council was composed of several members who were nominated by the President of the Privy Council from among the Vice President of the Council and the Councillors. It was their duty to deliberate over the bills entrusted to them and to report the result of their deliberations to the President. The Committee, at its meeting used to make inquiries of the cabinet and the ministers concerned about the matter under discussion and get their replies. And to the inquiries, the minister concerned, as a general rule, had to make his reply. On behalf of the minister, however, his subordinate officials frequently made replies. These assistant officials were all called 'explainers'.

"No shorthand whatever was used at the Privy
Council. The record of proceedings was made in
accordance with the provisions in the Privy Council
Regulations for Privy Council Procedure but it was
merely the record of minutes of the proceedings written
by the senior secretaries and not the exact record of all
utterances of all members who spoke.

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

"As for how to take notes of proceedings of the Investigation Committee meeting, there were no legal regulations in connection therewith, so that the gist of proceedings was recorded by the senior secretary for his keeping for reference. This practice was continued for a fairly long time; simply recording the subject, list of members present, summary of the proceedings, etc. In about 1921, however, there was a particularly diligent senior secretary and through his efforts, comparatively detailed notes of proceedings describing the gist of the utterance of each member came to be taken. But these were not the official records legally called for, so the records were sometimes precise and sometimes not, according to the judgment of the secretary in charge or the circumstances relative to the occasion. Sometimes it occurred that only a part of an utterance had been taken down.

"In no notes of the proceedings mentioned above were there any which were shown to state ministers or 'explainers' present for confirmation.

"/s/ MURAKAMI, Kyoichi"

18 19 20

21

22

23 24

. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I should like to ask one
BY MR. G. WILLIAMS (Continued):
Q Mr. Witness, could an "ex
a Privy Council meeting?
A No, an "explainer" did no
to vote at a Privy Council meeting
MR. G. WILLIAMS: You may
THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier
BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May
Tribunal, we do not wish to cross-
would like to refer the Tribunal t
evidence relating to this matter,
transcript pages 6,354 and 5 and 6
THE PRESIDENT: The witne
the usual terms.
(Whereupon, the with
excused.)
4 are the contents thereof
MR. G. WILLIAMS: The def
next witness OBATA Tadayoshi.
describe document Bo. 2592, the alth

additional question. first only swift,

plainer" vote at

t have the right

cross-examine. Quilliam.

it please the examine, but I o the prosecution exhibit 552, ,365.

ss is excused on mont and atota

ess was dayda.

ense calls as its

The FERRIDIES Brighter Quillion,

Exidence of the term of the please the term

THE FOR COTTESTS

day it of the wik-

8

bunel, the prospection object to the third paragraph

100 mm	TADAYOSHI OBATA, called as a witness on
	behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
	testified through Japanese interpreters as
	follows: expent bestimpings as to the charge.
	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	BY MR. G. WILLIAMS:
	Q Would you tell the Tribunal your name and
	address, please?
	A OBATA, Tadayoshi; my address is 42 Kitaya-
	macho, Tennogi-Ku, Osaka.
	MR. G. WILLIAMS: I ask that the witness be
	handed defense document No. 2592.
	(Whereupon, a document was handed
	to the witness.)
	Q Will you examine that document and state
	whether or not it is your affidavit?
	A This is definitely my affidavit.
	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
	A They are true and correct.
	MR. G. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence
	defense document No. 2592, the affidavit of the wit-
	ness OBATA.
	THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.
	BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tri-

1

bunal, the prosecution object to the third paragraph

on page 2 of the affidavit and submit that that paragraph should be deleted. It is the paragraph which commences, "Concerning Mr. HOSHINO's relations with the Ewantung Army." In our submission that paragraph contains nothing except testimonials as to the character of HOSHINO and the officers of the Ewantung Army, together with the impressions and opinions concerning those people.

We submit that that statement can have no probative value and is of no assistance to the Tri-

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Williams.

MR. G. WILLIAMS: If the Tribunal please, the relations of the accused HOSHINO with the Kwantung Army have been repeatedly raised by the prosecution in its case. This revolved around the issue of the conspiracy and the exploitation charge, and HOSHINO was specifically asked a question by the prosecution in its interrogation of him on that point.

We do not believe that an objective perusal of that paragraph will disclose it as being a character reference but, rather, a rational explanation of an issue raised by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court sustains the objection and admits the document without paragraph 3 on

the second page, on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2592 1 will receive exhibit No. 3214. 3 (Whereupon, the document above 4 referred to was marked defense exhibit 5 No. 3214 and received in evidence.) MR. G. WILLIAMS: I read the affidavit: 7 "I, Tadayoshi OBATA, having first been duly 0 sworn on oath as on attached sheet, and in accordance with the procedure followed in my country, hereby 10 depose as follows: As a second to the depose as to be de-11 "I reside at 42 Kitayamacho, Tennogi-Ku, 12 Osaka," 13 THE PRESIDENT: Do not depart from your 14 practice of omitting formal parts like that. 15 MR. G. WILLIAMS: Very well, I will proceed. 16 THE PRESIDENT: It is always important to 17 know who is talking, of course. 18 MR. G. WILLIAMS: That was the reason I had 19 proposed to read it, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: Well, he was Vice President 21 22 of the Planning Board but resigned in April '41. 23 Read from there.

MR. G. WILLIAMS (Reading continued):

"In April, 1945, I was appointed Governor of

25

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

21

22

Aichi Prefecture. In June, 1945, I was appointed 1 Governor General of the Tokai and Hokuriku District.

"During the period from 1932 to 1940 I had 3 occasion to make a number of trips to Manchuria and to spend considerable time there in connection with business. At that time I often saw Mr. HOSHINO, Haoki, who was then in the Government of Manchukuo, first in the Finance Ministry and later as Chief of the General Affairs Board.

"In the first years in Manchukuo it was difficult for Japanese or other business men to do business there, but it became much easier after Mr. HOSHINO assumed the position of Chief of General Affairs Board. For one thing, some of the young officers and young officials in Manchukuo did not welcome outside business men, particularly in the early days of the new state. Mr. HOSHINO tried to decrease this feeling, although this was a difficult thing to do. There was no discrimination between Japanese and other foreign businessmen in Manchuria. The same regulations applied to both.

"Mr. HOSHINO welcomed foreign capital which 23 was sincerely interested in building up Manchuria and was not aiming only at speculative purposes. I had a plan to start an automobile industry there with a . 7

.2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Japanese company and the General Motors Corporation from the United States. I suggested this and Mr. HOSHINO agreed with the idea. I told him American capital was necessary for Manchuria and he agreed with me. Later on Mr. AIKAWA came in to Manchukuo and set up the Manchurian Industrial Development Corporation. One of the inducements offered by Mr. AIKAWA was his ability to get in foreign capital, particularly American capital and technique. The Manchurian authorities, however, were strict in their requirement that any corporation coming in would have to be incorporated under the laws of Manchukuo, regardless of where the corporation came from. I know about this because I tried to set up a branch of Sumitomo there but could not do so, and had to establish a new company -- a Manchukuo corporation.

"It was Mr. 'HOSHINO's idea to develop all industry in the country, particularly agriculture, in order to lay a solid foundation for the country's economy and the people's welfare. He was interested in developing both light and heavy industry, especially the automotive industry, since Manchukuo was a vast country and had insufficient rail transportation. Trucks were particularly necessary for the agricultural development which he wanted to see take

24

place.

1

2

5

16

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

"Mr. HOSHINO was anxious for Manchukuo to grow as an independent state generally. The China Incident was a disappointment to him and he wanted it terminated as soon as possible. While he was Chief of the General Affairs Board, he told me there were too many Japanese officials in Manchukuo and that the native Manchurians should play a greater part in government and economic activities. He tried to reduce the number of Japanese officials. He said that if Manchukuo needed technical help, the Japanese should assist, provided they became Manchurian citizens and acted as such, not as Japanese."

THE PRESIDENT: You may continue the reading tomorrow morning.

We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning.

> (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday; 24 September 1947, at 0930.)

21

22

23

24